arXiv:1701.06088v1 [math.ST] 21 Jan 2017

Distributed inference for quantile regression processes

Stanislav Volgushev* Shih-Kang Chao† Guang Cheng‡

January 24, 2017

Abstract

The increased availability of massive data sets provides a unique opportunity to discover subtle patterns in their distributions, but also imposes overwhelming computational challenges. To fully utilize the information contained in big data, we propose a two-step procedure: (i) estimate conditional quantile functions at different levels in a parallel computing environment; (ii) construct a conditional quantile regression process through projection based on these estimated quantile curves. Our general quantile regression framework covers both linear models with fixed or growing dimension and series approximation models. We prove that the proposed procedure does not sacrifice any statistical inferential accuracy provided that the number of distributed computing units and quantile levels are chosen properly. In particular, a sharp upper bound for the former and a sharp lower bound for the latter are derived to capture the minimal computational cost from a statistical perspective. As an important application, the statistical inference on conditional distribution functions is considered. Simulations confirm our statistical inferential theory.

Keywords: B-spline estimation, conditional distribution function, distributed computing, divide-and-conquer, quantile regression process.

1 Introduction

The advance of technology in applications such as meteorological and environmental surveillance or e-commerce has led to extremely large data sets which cannot be processed with standalone computers due to processor, memory, or disk bottlenecks. Dividing data and computing among many machines is a common way to alleviate such bottlenecks, and can be implemented by parallel computing systems like Hadoop (White, 2012) with the aid of communication-efficient algorithms.

*Assistant Professor, Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto, 100 St. George Street Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 3G3. E-mail: stanislav.volgushev@utoronto.ca

†Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906. E-mail: skchao74@purdue.edu. Tel: +1 (765) 496-9544. Fax: +1 (765) 494-0558. Partially supported by Office of Naval Research.

‡Professor, Department of Statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906. E-mail: chengg@purdue.edu. Tel: +1 (765) 496-9549. Fax: +1 (765) 494-0558. Research Sponsored by NSF CAREER Award DMS-1151692, DMS-1418042, and Office of Naval Research.

In statistics, this approach to estimation has recently been adopted under the name divide-and-conquer, see Li et al. (2012); Jordan (2013). Pioneering contributions on theoretical analysis of divide and conquer algorithms focus on mean squared error rates Zhang et al. (2013, 2015). The analysis therein does not take into account a core question in statistics – inferential procedures. In the last two years, such procedures have been developed for various non- and semi-parametric estimation approaches that focus on the mean or other notions of central tendency, this line of work includes Cheng and Shang (2015); Zhao et al. (2016); Shi et al. (2016); Banerjee et al. (2016), among others. Focusing on the mean tendency illuminates one important aspect of the dependence between predictors and response, but ignores all other aspects of the conditional distribution of the response which can be equally important. Additionally, most of the work cited above assumes homoskedastic errors or sub-Gaussian tails. Both assumptions are easily violated in modern messy and large-scale data sets, and this limits the applicability of approaches that are available to date.

We propose to use quantile regression in order to extract features of the conditional distribution of the response while avoiding tail conditions and taking heteroskedasticity into account. This approach focuses on estimating the conditional quantile function $x \mapsto Q(x;\tau) := F^{-1}_{Y|X}(\tau|x)$ where $F_{Y|X}$ denotes the conditional distribution of response given predictor. A flexible class of models for conditional quantile functions can be obtained by basis expansions of the form $Q(x;\tau) \approx \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau)$. This includes linear models of fixed or increasing dimension where the approximation is replaced by an equality, as well as a rich set of non- and semi-parametric procedures such as tensor product B-splines or additive models.

Given data $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, quantile regression for such models is classically formulated through the following minimization problem:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau) := \arg\min_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_\tau\{Y_i - \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{Z}(X_i)\}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\rho_\tau(u) := \{\tau - \mathbf{1}(u \leq 0)\}u$ and $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. However, solving this minimization problem by classical algorithms requires that the complete data set is stored in a single computer. For large samples, this might not be feasible. This motivates us to utilize the divide and conquer approach where the full sample is randomly split across several computers into S smaller sub-samples of size n, the minimization in (1.1) is solved on each sub-sample, and results are averaged in the end to obtain the final estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ (see (2.3) in Section 2 for a formal definition). While this approach is easy to implement, the resulting estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ is typically not a solution to the original minimization problem (1.1). As illustrated in Figure 1.1, this can be problematic for inference procedures. More precisely, the left panel of Figure 1.1 depicts the coverage probabilities (on the y-axis) against number of sub-samples (on the x-axis) for asymptotic confidence intervals that are based on asymptotic distributions of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ but computed using $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ for three data generating processes (linear models with different dimension) and a fixed quantile $\tau = 0.1$. This indicates that choosing S too large results in invalid inference, as reflected by a rapid drop in coverage after a certain threshold is reached. For different models this threshold is different and it intrinsically depends on various properties of the underlying model such as dimension of predictors. These observations indicate that developing *valid* statistical inference procedures based on $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ requires a careful theoretical analysis of divide and conquer procedures. The first major

contribution of the present paper is to provide statistical inferential theory for this framework.



Figure 1.1: Left penal: coverage probabilities (y-axis) of confidence intervals for estimators computed from divide and conquer; x-axis: number of sub-samples S in log-scale. Different colors correspond to linear models with different $m = \dim(\mathbf{Z}(X))$. Right panel: necessary and sufficient conditions on (S, K) for the oracle rule in linear models with fixed dimension (Blue) and B-spline nonparametric models (Green). The dotted region is the discrepancy between the sufficient and necessary conditions.

The approach described so far provides a way to estimate the conditional quantile function for a single quantile. To obtain a picture of the entire conditional distribution of response given predictors, estimation of the conditional quantile function at several quantile levels is required. Performing such an estimation for a dense grid of quantiles can be computationally costly as estimation at each new quantile requires running the above algorithm anew. To relax this computational burden, we introduce the two-step *quantile projection algorithm*. In the first step, the divide and conquer algorithm is used to compute $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_1), ..., \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_K)$ for a grid of quantile values $\tau_1, ..., \tau_K$. In the second step, a matrix $\widehat{\Xi}$ is computed from $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_1), ..., \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_K)$ (see (2.7) for a formal definition). Given this matrix $\widehat{\Xi}$, the *quantile projection estimator* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ can be computed for any τ by performing a multiplication of this matrix with a known vector (depending on τ) without access to the original dataset. Based on $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$, we can estimate the conditional distribution function; see (2.8) and (2.9).

The computational cost of our procedure is determined by the number of sub-samples S and the number of quantile levels K. To minimize the computational burden, K should be chosen as small as possible. Choosing S large will allow us to maintain a small sample size n on each local machine, thus enabling us to process larger data sets. At the same time, classical inference procedures for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}$ (e.g. procedures based on asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}$) should remain valid for $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$.

A detailed analysis of conditions which ensure this "oracle rule" is conducted in Section 3. There, we derive *sufficient* conditions for both S and K, which are also proved to be necessary in some cases up to $\log N$ terms. Sufficient conditions of S take the form $S = o\big(N^{1/2} a_{N,m}\big)$ where $a_{N,m} \to 0$. The specific form of $a_{N,m}$ depends on the precise form of the model, with more complex models leading to $a_{N,m}$ converging to zero faster, thus placing more restrictions on S. Necessary and sufficient conditions on K take the form $K \gg N^{1/(2\eta)} \|\mathbf{Z}(x)\|^{-1/\eta}$, where $\eta > 0$ is the degree

of Hölder continuity (see (1.3)) of $\tau \mapsto Q(x;\tau)$. In particular, this lower bound is completely independent of S. An interesting insight which will be explained in more detail in Section 3.2 right after 3.6 is that for large values of $\|\mathbf{Z}\|$, which typically corresponds to more complex models, the restriction on K becomes weaker.

A graphical summary of the necessary and sufficient conditions on K and S derived in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 is provided in the right panel of Figure 1.1.

Deriving such necessary conditions on S, K is a crucial step in understanding the limitations of divide and conquer procedures, as it shows that the interplay between S, K and model complexity is indeed a feature of the underlying problem and not an artefact of the proof.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a formal description of all algorithms and estimation procedures discussed in this paper. Section 3 contains all theoretical results. In Section 4, we validate the finite sample relevance of our theoretical results through extensive Monte Carlo experiments. Proofs of all theoretical results are deferred to the appendix and an online supplement. The following notation will be used throughout the paper.

Notation. Let $\mathcal{X} := \text{supp}(X)$. Let $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Z}(X)$ and $\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{Z}(X_i)$ and assume $\mathcal{T} = [\tau_L, \tau_U]$ for some $0 < \tau_L < \tau_U < 1$. Define the true underlying measure of (Y_i, X_i) by P and denote the corresponding expectation as $\mathbb{E}$. Denote by $\|\mathbf{b}\|$ the L^2-norm of a vector $\mathbf{b}$. $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ are the smallest and largest eigenvalue of a matrix A. Let $\lfloor \eta \rfloor$ denote the integer part of a real number η, and $|\boldsymbol{j}| = j_1 + ... + j_d$ for d-tuple $\boldsymbol{j} = (j_1, ..., j_d)$. $\mathcal{S}^{m-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is the unit sphere. $a_n \asymp b_n$ means that $(|a_n/b_n|)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(|b_n/a_n|)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are bounded, and $a_n \gg b_n$ means $a_n/b_n \to \infty$. Define the classes of functions

$$\Lambda_c^\eta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}) :=$$
$$\Big\{ f_\tau \in \mathcal{C}^{\lfloor\eta\rfloor}(\mathcal{X}) : \tau \in \mathcal{T},\ \sup_{|\boldsymbol{j}|\le\lfloor\eta\rfloor} \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X},\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |D^{\boldsymbol{j}} f_\tau(x)| \le c,\ \sup_{|\boldsymbol{j}|=\lfloor\eta\rfloor} \sup_{x\neq y,\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \frac{|D^{\boldsymbol{j}} f_\tau(x) - D^{\boldsymbol{j}} f_\tau(y)|}{\|x-y\|^{\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor}} \le c \Big\}, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\Lambda_c^\eta(\mathcal{T}) := \Big\{ f \in \mathcal{C}^{\lfloor\eta\rfloor}(\mathcal{T}) : \sup_{j\le\lfloor\eta\rfloor} \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X},\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |D^j f(\tau)| \le c,\ \sup_{j=\lfloor\eta\rfloor} \sup_{\tau\neq\tau'} \frac{|D^j f(\tau) - D^j f_\tau(\tau')|}{\|\tau-\tau'\|^{\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor}} \le c \Big\}, \tag{1.3}$$

where η is called the "degree of Hölder continuity", and $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the class of α-continuously differentiable functions on a set $\mathcal{X}$.

2 A two-step procedure for computing quantile process

In this section, we formally introduce two algorithms studied throughout the paper - *divide and conquer* and *quantile projection*. The former is used to estimate quantile functions at fixed quantile levels, based on which the latter constructs an estimator for the quantile process. We also note that algorithms presented below can be applied for processing data that are locally stored for any reason and not necessarily large. As an important application, the estimation of conditional distribution functions will be presented.

We consider a general approximately linear model:

$$Q(x;\tau) \approx \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tag{2.1}$$

where $Q(x;\tau)$ is the τ-th quantile of the distribution of Y conditional on $X = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\mathbf{Z}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a vector of transformation of x. This framework (2.1) incorporates various estimation procedures, for instance, series approximation models (see (Belloni et al., 2016) for more discussion). In this paper, we will focus on three classes of transformation $\mathbf{Z}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ which include many models as special cases: fixed and finite m, diverging m with local support structure (e.g. B-splines) and diverging m *without* local support structure.

The *divide and conquer* algorithm for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)$ at a fixed $\tau \in (0,1)$ is described below:

1. Divide the data $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ into S sub-samples of size n[i]. Denote the s-th sub-sample as $\{(X_{is}, Y_{is})\}_{i=1}^n$ where $s = 1, ..., S$.

2. For each s and fixed τ, estimate the sub-sample based quantile regression coefficient as follows

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^s(\tau) := \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau\big\{Y_{is} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{Z}(X_{is})\big\}. \tag{2.2}$$

3. Each local machine sends $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^s(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ to the master that outputs a *pooled estimator*

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) := S^{-1} \sum_{s=1}^S \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^s(\tau). \tag{2.3}$$

Remark 2.1. The minimization problem in (2.2) is in general not strictly convex. Thus, several minimizers could exist. In the rest of this paper, we will only focus on the minimizer with the smallest ℓ_2 norm. This is assumed merely for presentational convenience, and a close look at the proofs reveals that all statements remain unchanged if any other minimizer is chosen instead.

While $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ defined in (2.3) gives an estimator at a fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, a complete picture of the conditional distribution is often desirable. To achieve this, we propose a two-step procedure. First compute $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_k) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for each $\tau_k \in \mathcal{T}_K$, where $\mathcal{T}_K \subset \mathcal{T} = [\tau_L, \tau_U]$ is grid of quantile values in $\mathcal{T}$ with $|\mathcal{T}_K| = K \in \mathbb{N}$. Second project each component of the vectors $\{\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_1), ..., \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_K)\}$ on a space of spline functions in τ. More precisely, let

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j := \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^q} \sum_{k=1}^K \big(\overline{\beta}_j(\tau_k) - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\big)^2, \quad j = 1, ..., m. \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mathbf{B} := (B_1, ..., B_q)^\top$ is a B-spline basis defined on equidistant knots $\tau_L = t_1 < ... < t_G = \tau_U$ with degree $r_\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ (we use the normalized version of B-splines as given in Definition 4.19 on page 124 in Schumaker (1981)). Here, uniformity of knots is assumed for simplicity, all theoretical results can be extended to knots with quasi uniform partitions. Using $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j$, we define the quantile projection estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\cdot) : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) := \widehat{\Xi}^\top \mathbf{B}(\tau), \tag{2.5}$$

[i]The equal sub-sample size is assumed for ease of presentation, and can be certainly relaxed.

where $\widehat{\Xi}$ is defined below. The jth element $\widehat{\beta}_j(\tau) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j^\top \mathbf{B}(\tau)$ can be viewed as projection, with respect to $\|f\|_K := (\sum_{k=1}^K f^2(\tau_k))^{1/2}$, of $\overline{\beta}_j$ onto the polynomial spline space with basis $B_1, ..., B_q$. Although we focus on B-splines in this paper, other basis functions are certainly possible.

The algorithm for computing the quantile projection matrix $\widehat{\Xi}$ is summarized below, in which the divide and conquer algorithm is applied as a subroutine:

1. Define a grid of quantile levels $\tau_k = \tau_L + (k/K)(\tau_U - \tau_L)$ for $k = 1, ..., K$. For each τ_k, compute $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_k)$ as (2.3).

2. For each $j = 1, ..., m$, compute

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j = \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\mathbf{B}(\tau_k)^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\overline{\beta}_j(\tau_k) \right), \tag{2.6}$$

   which is a closed form solution of (2.4).

3. Set the matrix

$$\widehat{\Xi} := [\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_1 \, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_2 \, ... \, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_m]. \tag{2.7}$$

A direct application of the above algorithm is to estimate the quantile function for *any* $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. A more important application of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ is the estimation of the conditional distribution function $F_{Y|X}(y|x)$ for any fixed x. More precisely, we consider

$$\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x) := \tau_L + \int_{\tau_L}^{\tau_U} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) < y\} d\tau, \tag{2.8}$$

where τ_L and τ_U are chosen close to 0 and 1. The intuition behind this approach is the observation that

$$\tau_L + \int_{\tau_L}^{\tau_U} \mathbf{1}\{Q(x;\tau) < y\} d\tau = \begin{cases} \tau_L & \text{if } F_{Y|X}(y|x) < \tau_L; \\ F_{Y|X}(y|x) & \text{if } \tau_L \le F_{Y|X}(y|x) \le \tau_U; \\ \tau_U & \text{if } F_{Y|X}(y|x) > \tau_U, \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

see (Chernozhukov et al., 2010; Volgushev, 2013). The estimator $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}$ is a smooth functional of the map $\tau \mapsto \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ (Chernozhukov et al., 2010). Hence, properties of $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}$ depend on the behavior of $\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ as a *process* in τ, which we will study in detail in Section 3.

3 Theoretical analysis

The following regularity conditions are needed throughout this paper.

(A1) Assume that $\|\mathbf{Z}_i\| \le \xi_m < \infty$, where ξ_m is allowed to diverge, and that $1/M \le \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]) \le \lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]) \le M$ holds uniformly in N for some fixed constant M.

(A2) The conditional distribution $F_{Y|X}(y|x)$ is twice differentiable w.r.t. y, with the corresponding derivatives $f_{Y|X}(y|x)$ and $f'_{Y|X}(y|x)$. Assume that $\bar{f} := \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}, x\in\mathcal{X}} |f_{Y|X}(y|x)| < \infty$ and $\overline{f'} := \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}, x\in\mathcal{X}} |f'_{Y|X}(y|x)| < \infty$ uniformly in N.

(A3) Assume that uniformly in N, there exists a constant $f_{\min} < \overline{f}$ such that

$$0 < f_{\min} \leq \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f_{Y|X}(Q(x;\tau)|x).$$

In these assumptions, we implicitly work with triangular array asymptotics for $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, where $d = \dim(X_i)$ is allowed to grow as well. Assumptions (A1) – (A3) are fairly standard in the quantile regression literature, see Belloni et al. (2016). The eigenvalue condition in (A1) is imposed for the purpose of normalization, which in turn determines the value of ξ_m. For basis expansions with local support such as B-splines, the right scaling to ensure the eigenvalue condition results is $\xi_m \asymp \sqrt{m}$.

3.1 Fixed dimensional linear models

In this section, we assume for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$Q(x;\tau) = \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathbf{Z}(x)$ has fixed dimension m. This simple model setup allows us to have a clear understanding on oracle rules. Specifically, we establish an explicit upper bound on S, i.e., $S = o(N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-2})$, under which $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ shares the same limiting distribution as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$. We also prove that this result breaks down if $S \gg N^{1/2}$. In other words, the upper bound on S is only improvable up to an order of $(\log N)^2$. To obtain the oracle rule for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$, we need to further impose a lower bound on K, i.e., $K \gg N^{1/(2\eta)}$, where the integer $\eta > 0$ denotes the number of continuous derivatives of $\tau \mapsto Q(x;\tau)$. We prove that the oracle rule for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ breaks down if $S \gg N^{1/2}$ *or* $K \gg N^{1/(2\eta)}$. Similar insights remain true for the more general models considered in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

Theorem 3.1 provides sufficient and necessary conditions on S under which $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ satisfies the oracle rule. We remark that the asymptotic distribution of the oracle estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ under various conditions has been known for a long time, see for instance Theorem 4.1 of Koenker (2005). Under (A1)-(A3) it was developed in Belloni et al. (2016). Denote by $\mathcal{P}_1(\xi_m, M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min})$ all pairs $(P, \mathbf{Z})$ of distributions P and transformations $\mathbf{Z}$ satisfying (A1)-(A3) with constants $0 < \xi_m, M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'} < \infty$, $f_{min} > 0$. Since m, ξ_m are constant in this section, we use the shortened notation $\mathcal{P}_1(\xi, M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min})$.

Theorem 3.1 (Oracle Rule for $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$)**.** *Suppose that* (3.1) *and assumptions (A1) – (A3) hold. If* $S = o(N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-2})$ *then, for any* $\tau \in \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$*, the estimator* $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ *defined in* (2.3) *satisfies*

$$\frac{\sqrt{N}\mathbf{u}^\top(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau))}{(\mathbf{u}^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(X)\mathbf{Z}(X)^\top]J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbf{u})^{1/2}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0, \tau(1-\tau)\big), \tag{3.2}$$

where $J_m(\tau) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top f_{Y|X}(Q(X;\tau)|X)]$*, which matches with the weak convergence of* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$*. If* $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}$*, weak convergence in (3.2) fails for some* $(P, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{P}_1(d^{1/2}, 1, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min}), \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$*.*

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is given in Section C.1. The weak convergence in (3.2) is derived from the following "aggregated Bahadur representation"

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -\frac{1}{N} J_m(\tau)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\} - \tau) + r_N(\tau) \tag{3.3}$$

where $r_N(\tau) = o_P(N^{-1/2})$ under the conditions of Theorem 3.1. To obtain (3.3), we develop a new Bahadur representation for each local estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^s(\tau)$, see Section A.1. The main novelty compared to existing results is a sharp bound on the *expectation* of the remainder term. This is crucial to obtain the bound $r_N(\tau) = o_P(N^{-1/2})$ in (3.3) under the condition $S = o(N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-2})$. In contrast, relying on previously available versions of the Bahadur representation would result in the condition $S = o(N^{1/3}(\log N)^{-4/3})$, which is a lot more restrictive. See Remark A.3 for details.

As a by-product of the proof of Theorem 3.1 we obtain the following result: there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \sup_{(P,\mathbf{Z})\in\mathcal{P}_1(d^{1/2},1,\bar{f},\overline{f'},f_{min})} \inf_{x_0\in\mathcal{X}} n\big|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)] - Q(x_0;\tau)\big| \geq C. \tag{3.4}$$

This lower bound result has an interesting implication: the precision of estimating Q in a divide-and conquer framework is restricted by n, the sample size that can be processed on a single machine, regardless of the total sample size N. A related observation was made in Example 1 of Zhang et al. (2013) who construct a data-generating process where the MSE rate of a divide and conquer estimator is limited by the sample size that can be processed on a single computer.

Next, we consider the oracle rule for the projected estimator $\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Recall the definition of G, r_τ given before the definition of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ in (2.5).

Theorem 3.2 (Oracle Rule for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\cdot)$)**.** *Suppose that* (3.1) *and assumptions (A1) – (A3) hold, and* $\tau \mapsto Q(x_0;\tau) \in \Lambda_c^\eta(\mathcal{T})$ *for a given* $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$*. If* $S = o(N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-2})$*, and* $K \gg G \gg N^{1/(2\eta)}$ *with* $r_\tau \geq \eta$ *then the projection estimator* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ *defined in* (2.5) *satisfies*

$$\sqrt{N}\big(\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\cdot) - Q(x_0;\cdot)\big) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}(\cdot) \text{ in } \ell^\infty(\mathcal{T}), \tag{3.5}$$

where $\mathbb{G}$ *is a centered Gaussian process with covariance structure*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{G}(\tau)\mathbb{G}(\tau')\big] = \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbf{Z}(X)\mathbf{Z}(X)^\top\big]J_m(\tau')^{-1}\mathbf{Z}(x_0)(\tau\wedge\tau' - \tau\tau'). \tag{3.6}$$

This matches the weak convergence of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}$*. If* $G \lesssim N^{1/(2\eta)}$ *or* $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}$ *the weak convergence in* (3.5) *fails for some* $(P,\mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{P}_1(d^{1/2},1,\bar{f},\overline{f'},f_{min})$ *and* $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ *with* $\tau \mapsto Q(x_0;\tau) \in \Lambda_c^\eta(\mathcal{T})$.

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is given in Section C.1. The fundamental tool for proving (3.5) is a Bahadur representation for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ based on (3.3) and the stability of the L_2 projection on the spline space in L_∞ norm (cf. Theorem A.1 of Huang (2003)). The process convergence is then derived from the leading term of the Bahadur representation of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$.

Theorem 3.2 characterizes the choice for parameters (S,K) which determine computational cost. The conditions on S remain the same as in Theorem 3.1. The process oracle rule requires restrictions on K based on the smoothness of $\tau \mapsto Q(x_0;\tau)$, denoted as η. Specifically, the lower bound on K in terms of N becomes smaller as η increases, which implies that smoother $\tau \mapsto Q(x_0;\tau)$ allow for larger computational savings. Theorem 3.2 implies that the condition on K is necessary for the oracle rule, no matter how S is chosen.

Next we apply Theorem 3.2 to the estimation of conditional distribution functions. Define

$$\widehat{F}^{or}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0) := \tau_L + \int_{\tau_L}^{\tau_U} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau) < y\}d\tau. \tag{3.7}$$

The asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{F}^{or}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)$ was derived in Chao et al. (2016).

Corollary 3.3. *Under the same conditions as Theorem 3.2, we have for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$,*

$$\sqrt{N}\big(\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0) - F_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\big) \rightsquigarrow -f_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\mathbb{G}\big(x_0; F_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\big) \quad \text{in } \ell^\infty\big((Q(x_0;\tau_L), Q(x_0;\tau_U))\big),$$

where $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)$ is defined in (2.8) *and $\mathbb{G}$ is a centered Gaussian process with covariance given in* (3.6)*. The same process convergence result holds with $\widehat{F}^{or}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)$ replacing $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)$.*

The proof of Corollary 3.3 uses the fact that $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x)$ is a Hadamard differentiable functional of $\tau \mapsto \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ for fixed x. The result of this corollary can be immediately extended to other functionals with such properties.

3.2 Approximate linear models with local basis structure

In this section, we consider models with $Q(x;\tau) \approx \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau)$ with $m = \dim(\mathbf{Z}) \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$ where the transformation $\mathbf{Z}$ can correspond to a basis expansion. The analysis in this section focuses on transformations $\mathbf{Z}$ with a specific local support structure, which will be defined more formally in Condition (L). Examples of such transformations include polynomial splines or wavelets. Compared to Section 3.1, we obtain several interesting insights. First, the sufficient and necessary conditions on S explicitly depend on m and become more restrictive as m increases. This shows that there is a fundamental limitation on possible computational savings that depends on the model complexity. Second, the necessary and sufficient conditions on K can become *less restrictive* if the model becomes more complex. This is due to the fact that the oracle estimator for more complex models can have a *slower* convergence rate. This slower rate is easier to match with the projection estimator, leading to less restrictive conditions on K.

Since the model $Q(x;\tau) \approx \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau)$ holds only approximately, there is no unique "true" value for $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau)$. Theoretical results for such models are often stated in terms of the following vector

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) := \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \mathbb{E}\big[(\mathbf{Z}^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma} - Q(X;\tau))^2 f(Q(X;\tau)|X)\big], \tag{3.8}$$

see Belloni et al. (2016); Chao et al. (2016). Note that $\mathbf{Z}^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)$ can be viewed as the (weighted L_2) projection of $Q(X;\tau)$ onto the approximation space. The resulting L_∞ approximation error is defined as

$$c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) := \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X},\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \big|Q(x;\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)^\top \mathbf{Z}(x)\big|. \tag{3.9}$$

For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ define the matrix $\widetilde{J}_m(\mathbf{v}) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top f(\mathbf{Z}^\top\mathbf{v}|X)]$. For any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbf{b}(\cdot) : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}^m$, define $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) := \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{b}(\tau))\mathbf{Z}|]$. Throughout the rest of this subsection, we assume the following condition:

(L) For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the vector $\mathbf{Z}(x)$ has zeroes in all but at most r consecutive entries, where r is fixed. Furthermore, $\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{Z}(x), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = O(1)$.

Condition (L) ensures that the matrix $\widetilde{J}_m(\mathbf{v})$ has a band structure for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that the off-diagonal entries of $\widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{v})$ decay exponentially fast (Lemma 6.3 in Zhou et al. (1998)). Next, we discuss an example of $\mathbf{Z}$ which satisfies (L).

Example 3.4 (Univariate polynomial spline)**.** Suppose that (A2)-(A3) hold and that X has a density on $\mathcal{X} = [0,1]$ uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity. Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}(x) = (\widetilde{B}_1(x), ..., \widetilde{B}_{J-p-1}(x))^\top$ be a polynomial spline basis of degree p defined on J uniformly spaced knots $0 = t_1 < ... < t_J = 1$, such that the support of each $\widetilde{B}_j$ is contained in the interval $[t_j, t_{j+p+1})$ and normalization is as given in Definition 4.19 on page 124 in Schumaker (1981). Let $\mathbf{Z}(x) := m^{1/2}(\widetilde{B}_1(x), ..., \widetilde{B}_{J-p-1}(x))^\top$, then there exists a constant $M > 1$ such that $M^{-1} < \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top] < M$ (by Lemma 6.2 of Zhou et al. (1998)). With this scaling we have $\xi_m \asymp \sqrt{m}$. Moreover, the first part of assumption (L) holds with $r = p + 1$, while the second part, i.e., $\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{Z}(x), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = O(1)$, is verified in Lemma A.6.

Define the following class of data-generation processes P_N and transformations $\mathbf{Z}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_L(M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min}, R) := \big\{&\text{all sequences } P_N \text{ of distributions of } (X,Y) \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \text{ and fixed } \mathbf{Z} \text{ satisfying}\\ &\text{(A1)-(A3) with } M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'} < \infty, f_{min} > 0, \text{and (L) for some } r < R;\\ &\xi_m^4(\log N)^6 = o(N), c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^2 = o(N^{-1/2})\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

The conditions in $\mathcal{P}_L(M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min}, R)$ ensure the weak convergence of the oracle estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$, see Chao et al. (2016).

The following condition characterizes the upper bound on S which is needed to ensure the oracle rule for $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$.

(L1) Assume that

$$S = o\bigg(\frac{N}{m\xi_m^2 \log N} \wedge \frac{N}{\xi_m^2 (\log N)^{10}} \wedge \frac{N^{1/2}}{\xi_m \log N} \wedge \frac{N^{1/2}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}{\xi_m^2 (\log N)^2}\bigg).$$

For specific examples, Condition (L1) can be simplified. For instance, in the setting of Example 3.4, we can reduce (L1) to the form $S = o(N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-2} m^{-1/2} \wedge N(\log N)^{-10} m^{-2})$.

We now present the sufficient and necessary conditions for the oracle rule of $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ under the condition (L) for $\mathbf{Z}$.

Theorem 3.5 (Oracle Rule for $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$)**.** *Assume that (L1) holds and that the data are generated from P_N with $(P_N, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{P}_L(M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min}, R)$. Then the pooled estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ defined in (2.3) satisfies for any fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}, x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{N}\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))}{(\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}(x_0))^{1/2}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0, \tau(1-\tau)\big), \tag{3.11}$$

where $J_m(\tau)$ is defined in Theorem 3.1. This matches the limiting behaviour of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}$. If $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}\xi_m^{-1}$ the weak convergence result (3.11) fails for some $(P_N, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{P}_L(1, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min}, R), x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$.

To compare the necessary and sufficient conditions in Theorem 3.5, assume for simplicity that $m \gg N^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$ and $\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\| \asymp \xi_m$ (this is, for instance, the case for univariate splines as discussed in Example 3.4). Since under (A1)-(A3) we have $m^{1/2} \lesssim \xi_m$, it follows that (L1) holds provided that $S = o(N^{1/2}\xi_m^{-1}(\log N)^{-2})$ and the necessary and sufficient conditions match up to a factor of $(\log N)^2$ as in Theorem 3.1.

The strategy for proving Theorem 3.5 is similar to that for Theorem 3.1, but the major difference is that we now apply an aggregated Bahadur representation in Section A.2 which makes explicit use of the local basis structure of $\mathbf{Z}$. Compared to a setting without such local basis structures this leads to sharper bounds in terms of m, ξ_m. See Section C.2.1 for a proof for (3.11) and Section C.3 for a proof of the necessary conditions in Theorem 3.5.

As a by-product of the proof of Theorem 3.5 we obtain the following result: there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \sup_{(P_N,\mathbf{Z})\in\mathcal{P}_L(M,\bar{f},\overline{f'},f_{min},R)} \inf_{x_0\in\mathcal{X}} \frac{n}{\xi_m^2}\big|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)] - \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\big| \geq C. \tag{3.12}$$

Equation (3.12) shows that the divide and conquer procedure introduces an additional bias, which is distinct from the 'non-parametric' bias resulting from approximation of $Q(x;\tau)$ by $\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\gamma_N(\tau)$. This bias is larger than its counterpart under fixed dimensional models in (3.4) since ξ_m may increase with n. Equation (3.12) can be interpreted as a fundamental bound on the precision that is attainable by the divide and conquer approach if n data points can be processed on a single machine. As in the setting in Section 3.1 this bound depends only on n, ξ_m and not on the total sample size N.

Next we discuss sufficient conditions for the process oracle rule.

Theorem 3.6 (Oracle Rule for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$)**.** *Consider an arbitrary vector $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Assume that data are generated from P_N with $(P_N, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{P}_L(M, \bar{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min}, R)$, that (L1) holds, that $\tau \mapsto Q(x_0;\tau) \in \Lambda_c^\eta(\mathcal{T})$, $r_\tau \geq \eta$, $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(N^{-1/2}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|)$ and $K \gg G \gg N^{1/(2\eta)}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-1/\eta}$ and that the limit*

$$H(\tau_1,\tau_2) := \lim_{N\to\infty} \|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-2}\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m^{-1}(\tau_1)\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]J_m^{-1}(\tau_2)\mathbf{Z}(x_0)(\tau_1\wedge\tau_2 - \tau_1\tau_2) \tag{3.13}$$

exists and is non-zero for any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}$, where $J_m(\tau)$ is defined in the statement of Theorem 3.1.

1. *The projection estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ defined in (2.5) satisfies*

$$\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}\big(\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\cdot) - Q(x_0;\cdot)\big) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}(\cdot) \text{ in } \ell^\infty(\mathcal{T}), \tag{3.14}$$

   where $\mathbb{G}$ is a centered Gaussian process with covariance structure $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{G}(\tau)\mathbb{G}(\tau')] = H(\tau,\tau')$. The same holds for the oracle estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$. If $G \lesssim N^{1/(2\eta)}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-1/\eta}$ or $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}\xi_m^{-1}$ the weak convergence in (3.14) fails for some $(P_N, \mathbf{Z})$ which satisfies the above conditions.

2. *For $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)$ defined in (2.8) and $\mathbb{G}$ defined above we have*

$$\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}\big(\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0) - F_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\big) \rightsquigarrow -f_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\mathbb{G}\big(x_0; F_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\big) \text{ in } \ell^\infty\big((Q(x_0;\tau_L), Q(x_0;\tau_U))\big).$$

   This matches the process convergence for $\widehat{F}^{or}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)$.

The proof of the sufficient conditions in Theorem 3.6 is presented in Section C.2.2, and the collapse of the weak convergence (3.14) is shown in Section C.3. Similar to the discussion after Theorem 3.2, the process oracle rule does not place additional restrictions on the number of subsamples S besides (L1). However, the process oracle rule requires additional assumptions on the

quantile grid $\mathcal{T}_K$. An interesting observation is that $G \gg (N/\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^2)^{1/(2\eta)}$ in Theorem 3.13 can be weaker than $G \gg N^{1/(2\eta)}$ from Theorem 3.2. For instance, this is true in the setting of Example 3.4 where $\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\| \asymp m^{1/2}$. Consequently, the computational burden is reduced since K can be chosen smaller. The intuition behind this surprising phenomenon is that the convergence rate for the estimator $\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ in nonparametric models is typically slower. Thus, less stringent assumptions are needed to ensure that the bias induced by quantile projection is negligible compared to the convergence rate of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$.

Remark 3.7. To the best of our knowledge, the only paper that also studies the sharpness of upper bounds for S that guarantee valid inference in a divide and conquer setting with nonparametric regression is Cheng and Shang (2015). However, Cheng and Shang (2015) only consider nonparametric *mean* regression in the smoothing spline setup.

3.3 Approximate linear models without local basis structure

In this section, we consider models with transformation $\mathbf{Z}$ of increasing dimension that do not have the special local structure considered in Section 3.2. This includes, for instance, linear models of increasing dimension which are not covered in the previous sections, as well as basis expansion models without a special local structure. The price for this generality is that we need to assume a more stringent upper bound for S and put additional growth restrictions on m in order to prove the oracle rule. The conditions on K remain the same.

Theorem 3.8 (Oracle Rule for $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$)**.** *Assume that conditions (A1)-(A3) hold and that additionally* $m^4(\log N)^{10} + m^2\xi_m^4 = o(N)$, $c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\xi_m = o(N^{-1/2})$. *Provided that additionally* $S = o(N^{1/2}/(m\xi_m^2(\log N)^2))$ *the estimator* $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ *defined in* (2.3) *satisfies*

$$\frac{\sqrt{N}\mathbf{u}_N^\top(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))}{(\mathbf{u}_N^\top J_m^{-1}(\tau)\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]J_m^{-1}(\tau)\mathbf{u}_N)^{1/2}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}\big(0, \tau(1-\tau)\big), \tag{3.15}$$

for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{u}_N \in \mathbb{R}^m$, *where* $J_m(\tau)$ *is defined in the statement of Theorem 3.1. The same holds for the oracle estimator* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$.

The proof of Theorem 3.8 is given in Section C.4.2, which is based on a novel aggregated Bahadur representation in Section A.1. We note that $m^4(\log N)^{10} + m^2\xi_m^4 = o(N)$ imposes restriction on model complexity. In particular, this requires $m = o(N^{1/4}(\log N)^{-5/2})$. An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.8 is the oracle rule for correctly specified models, including linear quantile regression with increasing dimension as a special case. In this case $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = 0$.

Corollary 3.9 (Oracle rule for correctly specified models)**.** *Assume that conditions (A1)-(A3) hold and that the quantile function satisfies* $Q(x;\tau) = \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)$ *with a transformation* $\mathbf{Z}(x)$ *of possibly increasing dimension* m *with each entry bounded almost surely. Then* $\mathbf{u}_N^\top\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ *satisfies the oracle rule provided that* $m^4(\log N)^{10} = o(N)$ *and* $S = o(N^{1/2}m^{-2}(\log N)^{-2})$.

This corollary reduces to Theorem 3.1 in Section 3.1 when m is fixed. It describes the effect of allowing m to increase on the sufficient upper bound for S. We note that $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = 0$ and $\xi_m \asymp m^{1/2}$ under the settings of Corollary 3.9, whose proof follows directly from Theorem 3.8.

Both Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.8 can be applied to local polynomial spline models, but Theorem 3.5 puts less assumptions on S and m than Theorem 3.8, because Theorem 3.5 exploits the local support property of splines. This is illustrated in the following Remark 3.10 for the specific setting of Example 3.4.

Remark 3.10 (Comparing Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.8 with univariate splines)**.** Let $\mathbf{Z}$ denote the univariate splines from Example 3.4 and let $\mathbf{u}_N := \mathbf{Z}(x_0)$ for a fixed $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. We assume that (A2) and (A3) hold and that X has a density on $\mathcal{X} = [0,1]$ that is uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity. We will verify in Section C.4.3 that (A1) holds with $\xi_m \asymp m^{1/2}$. For simplicity, assume that the bias $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)$ satisfies $\xi_m c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^2 = o(N^{-1/2})$. Theorem 3.5 shows that sufficient conditions for the oracle rule are $m^2(\log N)^6 = o(N)$ and $S = o((Nm^{-1}(\log N)^{-4})^{1/2} \wedge (Nm^{-2}(\log N)^{-10}))$. On the other hand, Theorem 3.8 requires the more restrictive conditions $m^4(\log N)^{10} = o(N)$ and $S = o(N^{1/2}m^{-2}(\log N)^{-2})$.

Remark 3.10 indicates that Theorem 3.5 gives sharper bounds than Theorem 3.8 when both results are applicable. Note however that Theorem 3.8 applies to more general settings since, in contrast to Theorem 3.5, it does not require Condition (L). For instance, linear models as discussed in Corollary 3.9 can in general not be handled by Theorem 3.5. Finally, we discuss sufficient conditions for the process oracle rule.

Theorem 3.11 (Oracle Rule for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$)**.** *Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, let the conditions of Theorem 3.8 hold. Suppose that $\tau \mapsto Q(x_0;\tau) \in \Lambda_c^\eta(\mathcal{T})$, $r_\tau \geq \eta$, $K \gg G \gg N^{1/(2\eta)}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-1/\eta}$, and $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|N^{-1/2})$. Let the limit $H(\tau_1,\tau_2)$ defined in* (3.13) *exist and be non-zero for any $\tau_1,\tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}$*

1. *The projection estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ defined in* (2.5) *satisfies*

$$\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}\big(\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\cdot) - Q(x_0;\cdot)\big) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}(\cdot) \text{ in } \ell^\infty(\mathcal{T}), \tag{3.16}$$

   where $\mathbb{G}$ is a centered Gaussian process with covariance structure $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{G}(\tau)\mathbb{G}(\tau')] = H(\tau,\tau')$. This matches the process convergence of $\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$.

2. *The estimator $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)$ defined in* (2.8) *satisfies,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}\big(\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0) - F_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\big) \rightsquigarrow -f_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\mathbb{G}\big(F_{Y|X}(\cdot|x_0)\big) \text{ in } \ell^\infty\big((Q(x_0;\tau_L), Q(x_0;\tau_U))\big),$$

   where and $\mathbb{G}$ is the centered Gaussian process from (3.16)*. The same is true for $\widehat{F}^{or}_{Y|X}$.*

Remark 3.12. The weak convergence in (3.15) was derived with the centering $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ for notational convenience. As pointed out in Chao et al. (2016), other choices of centering sequences can be advantageous (for instance, this is the case in the setting of partial linear models). The conclusions of Theorem 3.8 can be generalized by replacing $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ in there by other vectors $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)$ as long as certain technical conditions are satisfied. However, this requires additional notation and technicalities. To keep the presentation simple we provide those details in Section C.4.1 in the appendix.

The proof of Theorem 3.11 is given in Section C.4.4. Note that the condition on K is the same as in Theorem 3.6. Results along the line of Theorem 3.11 can be obtained for any estimator of the form $\mathbf{u}_N^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\cdot)$, as long as $\mathbf{u}_N$ satisfies certain technical conditions. For example, the partial derivative, the average derivative and the conditional average derivative of $Q(x;\tau)$ in x fall into this framework. For brevity, we refer the interested reader to Section 2.3 of Belloni et al. (2016) for examples of vectors $\mathbf{u}_N$ and omit the technical details.

4 Monte Carlo experiments

In this section, we demonstrate the oracle properties of the divide and conquer estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ as well as the distribution function estimator $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x)$ through Monte Carlo simulations. Both linear and nonparametric models are considered with different error distributions such as normal and exponential. Fix $\mathcal{T} = [\tau_L, \tau_U]$ where $\tau_L = 0.05$ and $\tau_U = 0.95$, and denote by S^* as the value of S after which the coverage probabilities start to drop below the nominal level. All the figures in this section are postponed to the end of this section.

From almost all simulations, we observe that the pattern of coverage probabilities varies at different τ. For example, in the linear models with normal errors, the coverage probabilities at tail quantiles ($\tau = 0.1, 0.9$) drop to zero much faster than those at $\tau = 0.5$. These empirical observations are not inconsistent with our theory where only the orders of the upper bound for S are shown to be the same irrespective of the value of τ. Rather, this phenomenon might be explained by different derivatives of the error density that appear in the estimation bias, and is left for future study.

4.1 Linear model

In this section, we consider the linear model:

$$Y_i = 0.21 + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{m-1}^\top X_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, ..., N. \tag{4.1}$$

Given the error distribution function F_ϵ, we have $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau) = (0.21 + F_\epsilon^{-1}(\tau), \boldsymbol{\beta}_{m-1}^\top)^\top$. The covariate X_i follows a multivariate uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}([0,1]^{m-1})$ with $\mathrm{Cov}(X_{ij}, X_{ik}) = 0.1^2 0.7^{|j-k|}$ for $j, k = 1, ..., m-1$. Such a random variable can be simulated by first drawing $\widetilde{X}_i$ from a zero-mean multivariate normal distribution by applying the transformation $X_{ij} = \Phi_{\sigma=0.1}(\widetilde{X}_{ij})$, where $\Phi_{\sigma=0.1}(\cdot)$ is the distribution function of a mean-zero normal distribution with variance 0.1^2; see Falk (1999).

Consider three choices of $m = 4, 16, 32$. The intercept is given, and we set the remaining coefficients as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\beta}_3 &= (0.21, -0.89, 0.38)^\top; \\
\boldsymbol{\beta}_{15} &= (\boldsymbol{\beta}_3^\top, 0.63, 0.11, 1.01, -1.79, -1.39, 0.52, -1.62, 1.26, -0.72, 0.43, -0.41, -0.02)^\top; \\
\boldsymbol{\beta}_{31} &= (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{15}^\top, 0.21, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{15}^\top)^\top.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Section 4.1.1 concerns $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ defined in (2.3), while Section 4.1.2 discusses $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x)$ defined in (2.8).

4.1.1 Oracle rule for $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$

According to Theorem 3.1, an $(1-\alpha)$-th confidence interval for $x_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau)$ is

$$\big[x_0^\top \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) \pm N^{-1/2} f_{\varepsilon,\tau}^{-1} \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau) x_0^\top \Sigma_X^{-1} x_0}\, \Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha/2)\big], \tag{4.3}$$

where $f_{\varepsilon,\tau} = f_\epsilon(F_\epsilon^{-1}(\tau))$, f_ϵ is the error density and $\Sigma_X = \mathbb{E}[(1, X_i^\top)^\top (1, X_i^\top)]$. Here, we set $x_0 = (1, (m-1)^{-1/2} \mathbf{l}_{m-1}^\top)^\top$, where $\mathbf{l}_{m-1}$ is an $(m-1)$ vector with each entry equal to 1.

We next verify the oracle rule by checking whether the empirical coverage probability of (4.3) would be $(1-\alpha)$, and are also interested in the impact of N, S and m on the coverage probability. Figure 4.1 shows the coverage probabilities at three different τ levels for an error $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. In all plots, the coverage probabilities reach the nominal level $(1-\alpha)$ for $S < S^*$, and then drop quickly to 0 for $S > S^*$. At fixed m, when N increases, S^* shifts toward $N^{1/2}$, which is proven to be the sharp upper bound in Theorem 3.1. Hence, our theory is backed up by simulations. Also, when N is fixed, a larger dimensionality m leads to a smaller S^*. In Figure 4.2, an exponential error $\varepsilon \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ is considered. In comparison to the normal error, we note that when τ is small, N needs to be large enough to attain the same magnitude of S^* due to the skewness of $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$.

4.1.2 Oracle rule for $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x)$

We compute $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y_0|x_0)$ defined in (2.8) discretely with an equidistant partition of size 1000 on $[\tau_L, \tau_U]$. The involved $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ is computed as in (2.5) with $\mathbf{B}$ being cubic B-spline with dimension q defined on $G = 4 + q$ knots. The knots form a partition on $[\tau_L, \tau_U]$ with repetitions on the boundary; see Corollary 4.10 of Schumaker (1981). For simplicity, we set $y_0 = Q(x_0; \tau)$ so that $F_{Y|X}(y_0|x_0) = \tau$, where x_0 is chosen as in Section 4.1.1. By Corollary 3.3, an $(1-\alpha)$-th confidence interval for τ is

$$\big[\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(Q(x_0;\tau)|x_0) \pm N^{-1/2} \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau) x_0^\top \Sigma_X^{-1} x_0}\, \Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha/2)\big]. \tag{4.4}$$

We fix $N = 2^{14}$ in this section.

Our simulation study was designed to reflect the impact of S, m, q and K on the coverage probability of (4.4). We note that q and K have similar impact on coverage probabilities given that other parameters are held fixed. So, from now on, only the influence from q, S and m is discussed. In Figure 4.3 with $\varepsilon \sim N(0, 0.1^2)$, we note that increasing the number of of basis functions in $\mathbf{B}$, i.e., q, improves the coverage probabilities given that m, S are held fixed. Also, at a fixed S, q can be chosen smaller if m is larger. This is consistent with Theorem 3.6 that requires $q \gg N^{1/(2\eta)} \|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-\eta}$. Similar as Section 4.1.1, an increase of the dimensionality m leads to a smaller S^* for any fixed q. In Figure 4.4 with $\varepsilon \sim \text{Exp}(0.8)$, one difference we note is that the performance of the coverage probability is better when τ is small.

4.2 Nonparametric model

In this section, we consider a nonparametric model

$$Y_i = 2.5 + \sin(2X_i) + 2\exp(-16X_i^2) + 0.7\epsilon_i, \quad X_i \sim \mathcal{U}(-1, 1), \quad \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \tag{4.5}$$

where the true function $2.5 + \sin(2x) + 2\exp(-16x^2)$ is plotted in Figure 4.5. Basis $\mathbf{Z}$ is set as cubic B-spline defined at $m + 4$ knots. The knots form a partition on $[-1, 1]$ with repetitions on the boundary; see Corollary 4.10 of Schumaker (1981). The model (4.5) implies the quantile of Y is $Q(x; \tau) = 2.5 + \sin(2x) + 2\exp(-16x^2) + 0.7\Phi^{-1}(\tau)$ for $0 < \tau < 1$.

Section 4.2.1 concerns $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ defined in (2.3), while Section 4.1.2 deals with $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x)$ defined in (2.8). In both sections, we fix $N = 2^{16}$.

4.2.1 Oracle rule for $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$

According to Theorem 3.5, an $(1 - \alpha)$-th confidence interval for $Q(x_0; \tau)$ is

$$\big[\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) \pm N^{-1/2}\phi_\sigma^{-1}(\Phi_\sigma^{-1}(\tau))\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}\sigma_0(\mathbf{Z})\Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha/2)\big], \tag{4.6}$$

where $\sigma_0^2(\mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(X)\mathbf{Z}^\top(X)]^{-1}\mathbf{Z}(x_0)$ and ϕ_σ is the density of a zero-mean normal distribution with standard deviation σ.

Our simulation was designed to reflect how S and the number of basis functions in $\mathbf{Z}$, i.e., m, influence the coverage probabilities of (4.6). For all the plots in Figure 4.6, the coverage probability corresponding to $m = 13$ at $x_0 = 0$ (the solid green curves) performs the worst. This is partly caused by the large bias from the large curvature of $Q(x_0; \tau)$ at $x_0 = 0$ (see Figure 4.5). However, this bias can be reduced by setting greater m, leading to better performances as observed in the plots. On the other hand, the increase of m results in a smaller S^*.

4.2.2 Oracle rule for $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x)$

We compute $\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(y|x)$ in a similar way as Section 4.1.2 by taking $y_0 = Q(x_0; \tau) = f(x_0) + 0.7\Phi^{-1}(\tau)$, which gives $F_{Y|X}(y_0|x_0) = \tau$. By Theorem 3.6, an $(1-\alpha)$-th confidence interval for τ is

$$\big[\widehat{F}_{Y|X}(Q(x_0;\tau)|x_0) \pm N^{-1/2}\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}\sigma_0(\mathbf{Z})\Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha/2)\big], \tag{4.7}$$

where $\sigma_0^2(\mathbf{Z})$ is defined as in (4.6). Consider $\tau = 0.1$ in Figure 4.7. The results for $\tau = 0.5, 0.9$ show better performance as in Figure 4.3, but are not reported here due to space constraints. Our simulation study was designed to investigate the impact of S, m, q and K. Figure 4.7 shows that a larger number of basis functions in $\mathbf{Z}$, i.e., m, leads to a smaller estimation bias, and thus improves performance under fixed S, q and K. However, such an increase of m also results in smaller S^*. Under a fixed m, the influence from S, q and K on the coverage probabilities is similar to the linear models with normal errors in Section 4.1.2. These findings are consistent with Theorem 3.6.


Normal(0, 0.1^2) , τ = 0.1
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , τ = 0.5
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , τ = 0.9
Normal(0, 1) , τ = 0.1
Normal(0, 1) , τ = 0.5
Normal(0, 1) , τ = 0.9
Coverage Probability
log$_N$(S)
N = 2^{14} , m = 4
N = 2^{22} , m = 4
N = 2^{14} , m = 16
N = 2^{22} , m = 16
N = 2^{14} , m = 32
N = 2^{22} , m = 32

Figure 4.1: Coverage probability of (4.3) with model error $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ in linear model (4.1). Nominal coverage 0.95.


Exp (0.8) , τ = 0.1
Exp (0.8) , τ = 0.5
Exp (0.8) , τ = 0.9
Exp (8) , τ = 0.1
Exp (8) , τ = 0.5
Exp (8) , τ = 0.9
Coverage Probability
log$_N$(S)
N = 2^{14} , m = 4
N = 2^{22} , m = 4
N = 2^{14} , m = 16
N = 2^{22} , m = 16
N = 2^{14} , m = 32
N = 2^{22} , m = 32

Figure 4.2: Coverage probability of (4.3) with model error $\varepsilon \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ in linear model (4.1). Nominal coverage 0.95.

(a) $m = 4$


Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 4 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.1)
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 4 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.5)
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 4 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.9)
Coverage Probability
logN(S)
q = 7 , K = 20
q = 7 , K = 30
q = 10 , K = 20
q = 10 , K = 30
q = 15 , K = 20
q = 15 , K = 30

(b) $m = 16$


Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 16 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.1)
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 16 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.5)
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 16 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.9)
Coverage Probability
logN(S)
q = 7 , K = 20
q = 7 , K = 30
q = 10 , K = 20
q = 10 , K = 30
q = 15 , K = 20
q = 15 , K = 30

(c) $m = 32$


Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 32 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.1)
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 32 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.5)
Normal(0, 0.1^2) , m= 32 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.9)
Coverage Probability
logN(S)
q = 7 , K = 20
q = 7 , K = 30
q = 10 , K = 20
q = 10 , K = 30
q = 15 , K = 20
q = 15 , K = 30

Figure 4.3: Coverage probability of (4.4) with model error $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1^2)$ in linear model (4.1). Nominal coverage 0.95. $N = 2^{14}$.

(a) $m = 4$


Exp (0.8) , m= 4 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.1)
Exp (0.8) , m= 4 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.5)
Exp (0.8) , m= 4 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.9)
Coverage Probability
logN(S)
q = 7 , K = 20
q = 7 , K = 30
q = 10 , K = 20
q = 10 , K = 30
q = 15 , K = 20
q = 15 , K = 30

(b) $m = 16$


Exp (0.8) , m= 16 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.1)
Exp (0.8) , m= 16 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.5)
Exp (0.8) , m= 16 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.9)
Coverage Probability
logN(S)
q = 7 , K = 20
q = 7 , K = 30
q = 10 , K = 20
q = 10 , K = 30
q = 15 , K = 20
q = 15 , K = 30

(c) $m = 32$


Exp (0.8) , m= 32 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.1)
Exp (0.8) , m= 32 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.5)
Exp (0.8) , m= 32 , y0 = Q(x0 ; τ = 0.9)
Coverage Probability
logN(S)
q = 7 , K = 20
q = 7 , K = 30
q = 10 , K = 20
q = 10 , K = 30
q = 15 , K = 20
q = 15 , K = 30

Figure 4.4: Coverage probability of (4.4) with model error $\varepsilon \sim \text{Exp}(0.8)$ in linear model (4.1). Nominal coverage 0.95. $N = 2^{14}$.



Figure 4.5: The plot for the function $2.5 + \sin(2x) + 2\exp(-16x^2)$.



Figure 4.6: Coverage probability of (4.6) with multiple choices of x_0 and m. Nominal coverage 0.95. $N = 2^{16}$.



Figure 4.7: Coverage probability of (4.7) with multiple choices of x_0 and m. Nominal coverage 0.95. $N = 2^{16}$.

APPENDIX

A. Additional technical results

Additional Notation. Let $\mathcal{S}^{m-1} := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|\mathbf{u}\| = 1\}$ denote the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^m$. For a set $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, ..., m\}$, define

$$\mathbb{R}^m_{\mathcal{I}} := \{\mathbf{u} = (u_1, ..., u_m)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m : u_j \neq 0 \text{ if and only if } j \in \mathcal{I}\} \tag{A.1}$$

$$\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}} := \{\mathbf{u} = (u_1, ..., u_m)^\top \in \mathcal{S}^{m-1} : u_j \neq 0 \text{ if and only if } j \in \mathcal{I}\} \tag{A.2}$$

For simplicity, we sometimes write $\sup_\tau(\inf_\tau)$ and $\sup_x(\inf_x)$ instead of $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}(\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}})$ and $\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}}(\inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}})$ throughout the Appendix. I_k is the k-dimensional identity matrix for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

A.1 Aggregated Bahadur representation for general series approximation model

Note that Assumptions (A1)-(A3) imply that for any sequence of $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued functions $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)$ satisfying $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \sup_x |\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)^\top \mathbf{Z}(x) - Q(x;\tau)| = o(1)$, the smallest eigenvalues of the matrices

$$\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top f_{Y|X}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)^\top \mathbf{Z}|X)], \quad J_m(\tau) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top f_{Y|X}(Q(X;\tau)|X)] \tag{A.3}$$

are bounded away from zero uniformly in τ for sufficiently large n. Define for any vector of functions $\mathbf{b}_N : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$g_N(\mathbf{b}_N) := \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \big\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \mathbf{b}_N(\tau)\} - \tau)]\big\|. \tag{A.4}$$

Theorem A.1 (ABR for General Series Model)**.** *Assume that the underlying distribution of (X_i, Y_i) satisfies conditions (A1)-(A3) and that $m\xi_m^2 \log n = o(n)$. Consider any sequence $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)$ such that $g_n := g_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = o(\xi_m^{-1}), c_m := c_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = o(1)$. Then we have*

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -\frac{1}{N} J_m(\tau)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\} - \tau) + r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)$$

where, for any $\kappa_n \ll n/\xi_m^2$, any sufficiently large n, and a constant C independent of n

$$P\Big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \|r_N^{(1)}(\tau)\| \geq C R_{1,n}(\kappa_n)\Big) \leq S e^{-\kappa_n} \tag{A.5}$$

with

$$R_{1,n}(\kappa_n) := \xi_m\Big(\Big(\frac{m}{n}\log n\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{\kappa_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2}\Big)^2 + c_m\Big(\Big(\frac{m}{n}\log n\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{\kappa_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2}\Big) + g_n. \tag{A.6}$$

Moreover there exists a constant C independent of n, S such that for n sufficiently large and $A \geq 1$

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} P\Big(\big\|r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\big\| > C R_{2,n}(A, \kappa_n)\Big) \leq 2Sn^{-A} + 2e^{-\kappa_n^2} \tag{A.7}$$

where

$$R_{2,n}(A,\kappa_n) := \frac{A\kappa_n}{S^{1/2}}\Big(\frac{m}{n}\Big)^{1/2}\Big((\xi_m g_n \log n)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{m\xi_m^2(\log n)^3}{n}\Big)^{1/4}\Big) + \Big(1 + \frac{\kappa_n}{S^{1/2}}\Big)\Big(g_n^2\xi_m^2 + \frac{m\xi_m^2 \log n}{n}\Big). \tag{A.8}$$

See Section B.1 for a proof for Theorem A.1. We give a simpler expression for the remainder terms in the following remark.

Remark A.2. *For subsequent applications of the Bahadur representation Theorem A.1, we will often set $\kappa_n = A \log n$ for a sufficiently large constant $A > 0$, and assume the remainder terms $r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)$, defined in Theorem A.1, are bounded with certain order.*

Under the conditions $\kappa_n = A \log n$, $(\log n)^2 S^{-1} = o(1)$ and $m \geq 1$, $R_{1,n}(\kappa_n) + R_{2,n}(\kappa_n)$ can be bounded by (neglecting a positive constant)

$$c_m\Big(\frac{m}{n}\log n\Big)^{1/2} + g_n + \frac{\log n}{S^{1/2}}\Big(\frac{m}{n}\Big)^{1/2}\Big((\xi_m g_n \log n)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{m\xi_m^2(\log n)^3}{n}\Big)^{1/4}\Big) + g_n^2\xi_m^2 + \frac{m\xi_m^2 \log n}{n}. \tag{A.9}$$

We note that without the condition $(\log n)^2 S^{-1} = o(1)$, we have an additional $\log n$ factor to the last two terms in (A.9).

Remark A.3. *A result along the lines of Theorem A.1 can also be obtained by a direct application of the classical Bahadur representation (e.g. Theorem 5.1 in Chao et al. (2016)), but that leads to bounds on remainder terms that are less sharp compared to the ones provided in* (A.5)-(A.8). *To illustrate this point, assume that $Q(x;\tau) = x^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}(\tau)$ with x denoting a covariate of fixed dimension. In this case $g_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = c_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = 0$ and ξ_m, m are constant. The classical Bahadur representation in Theorem 5.1 of Chao et al. (2016) yields an expansion of the form*

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^s(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -\frac{1}{n} J_m(\tau)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{is}(\mathbf{1}\{Y_{is} \leq Q(X_{is};\tau)\} - \tau) + r_n^s$$

where $J_m(\tau) := \mathbb{E}[XX^\top f_{Y|X}(Q(X;\tau)|X)]$, $r_n^s = O_P(n^{-3/4}\log n)$ and the exponent of n in the bound on r_n^s can in general not be improved. Applying this expansion to the estimator in each group we obtain

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -\frac{1}{N} J_m(\tau)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq Q(X_i;\tau)\} - \tau) + \frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^{S} r_n^s. \tag{A.10}$$

Without additional information on the moments of r_n^s, the bound $r_n^s = O_P(n^{-3/4}\log n)$ would at best provide a bound of the form $\frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^{S} r_n^s = O_P(n^{-3/4}\log n)$. Thus by the representation (A.10) *the oracle rule holds provided that $n^{-3/4}\log n = o(N^{-1/2})$, which is equivalent to $S = o(N^{1/3}(\log N)^{-4/3})$ for an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. In contrast, for $c_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = g_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = 0$ the bound in* (A.9) *reduces to $n^{-1}\log n + n^{-3/4}S^{-1/2}(\log n)^{7/4}$. Since $N = Sn$ this is of order $o(N^{-1/2})$ if $S = o(N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-2})$. This is a considerably less restrictive condition than $S = o(N^{1/3}(\log N)^{-4/3})$ which was derived by the 'direct' approach above. Similar arguments apply in a more general setting of a linear model with increasing dimension or series expansions.*

A.2 Aggregated Bahadur representation for local basis functions

Theorem A.4 (ABR for local basis functions)**.** *Assume that the underlying distribution satisfies conditions (A1)-(A3) and let Condition (L) hold. Assume that* $m\xi_m^2 \log n = o(n)$, $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(1)$ *and that* $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^2 = o(\xi_m^{-1})$. *Then we have for* $\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}$ *(defined in* (A.2)*) with* $\mathcal{I}$ *consisting of* $L = O(1)$ *consecutive integers (*$\mathcal{I}$ *is allowed to depend on* n*)*

$$\mathbf{u}_N^\top \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \mathbf{u}_N^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) = -\frac{1}{N}\mathbf{u}_N^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\} - \tau) + r_N^{(1)}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_N) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_N) \tag{A.11}$$

where, for any $\kappa_n \ll n/\xi_m^2$*, any sufficiently large* n*, and a constant* C *independent of* n

$$P\Big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}} \|r_N^{(1)}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_N)\| \ge C R_{1,n}^{(L)}(\kappa_n)\Big) \le S e^{-\kappa_n}. \tag{A.12}$$

where

$$R_{1,n}^{(L)}(\kappa_n) := \frac{\xi_m \log n}{n} + \sup_{\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{u}_N, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^2 + \frac{\xi_m^2 (\log n)^2 + \xi_m^2 \kappa_n}{n}\Big). \tag{A.13}$$

Moreover there exists a constant C *independent of* n, S *such that for* n *sufficiently large and* $A \ge 1$

$$\sup_\tau P\Big(\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}} \Big|r_N^{(2)}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_N)\Big| > C R_{n,2}^{(L)}(A, \kappa_n)\Big) \le 2Sn^{-A} + 2e^{-\kappa_n^2} \tag{A.14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n,2}^{(L)}(A, \kappa_n) := {} & A \sup_{\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{u}_N, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(1 + \frac{\kappa_n}{S^{1/2}}\Big)\Big(c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^4 + \frac{\xi_m^2 (\log n)^2}{n}\Big) \\ & + A\frac{\kappa_n}{n^{1/2} S^{1/2}}\Big(c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)(\kappa_n^{1/2} \vee \log n) + \frac{\xi_m^{1/2}(\kappa_n^{1/2} \vee \log n)^{3/2}}{n^{1/4}}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

See Section B.2 for a proof of Theorem A.4.

The following corollary gives an ABR representation which centered at the true function.

Corollary A.5. *If the conditions in Theorem A.4 hold, and additionally for a fixed* $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\| N^{-1/2})$. *Then for any* $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, (A.11) *in Theorem A.4 holds with* $\mathbf{u}_N$ *and* $\mathbf{u}_N^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)$ *being replaced by* $\mathbf{Z}(x_0)$ *and* $Q(x_0; \tau)$.

Lemma A.6. $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}, x\in[0,1]} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{Z}(x)\widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))\mathbf{Z}| = O(1)$ *and* $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}, x\in[0,1]} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{Z}(x) J_m^{-1}(\tau)\mathbf{Z}| = O(1)$ *under the setting of Example 3.4.* □

The proof of Lemma A.6 follows by similar arguments as the proof of Remark 2.4 from Chao et al. (2016) and is omitted for brevity.

B. Proofs for Appendix A

B.1 Proof of Theorem A.1

From Theorem S.1.1 we obtain the representation

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^s(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -n^{-1/2} J_m(\tau)^{-1} \mathbb{G}_n^s(\psi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau)) + r_{n,1}^s(\tau) + r_{n,2}^s(\tau) + r_{n,3}^s(\tau) + r_{n,4}^s(\tau).$$

where the quantities $r^1_{n,j}, ..., r^S_{n,j}$ are i.i.d. for each $j = 1, ..., 4$ and

$$\mathbb{G}^s_n(\psi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau)) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Y_{is}, \mathbf{Z}(X_{is}); \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau).$$

Letting

$$r^{(1)}_N(\tau) := \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \Big(r^s_{n,1}(\tau) + r^s_{n,2}(\tau) + r^s_{n,4}(\tau) \Big)$$

we find that the bound in (A.5) is a direct consequence of Theorem S.1.1, the union probability bound and the observation that $\xi_m g_n^2 = o(g_n)$ by the assumption $g_n = o(\xi_m^{-1})$.

Next, let

$$r^{(2)}_N(\tau) := \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S r^s_{n,3}(\tau).$$

Define $\widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau) := r^s_{n,3}(\tau) - \mathbb{E}[r^s_{n,3}(\tau)]$ and consider the decomposition

$$r^s_{n,3}(\tau) = \widetilde{r}^s_{n,3} \mathbf{1}\big\{ \|\widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau)\| \le D_n(A) \big\} + \widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau) \mathbf{1}\big\{ \|\widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau)\| > D_n(A) \big\} + \mathbb{E}[r^s_{n,3}(\tau)] =: \sum_{j=1}^3 R^{(s)}_{n,j}(\tau)$$

where, for a sufficiently large constant C,

$$D_n(A) := C\mathfrak{R}_3(A \log n) + C_1 \xi_m \Big(g_n^2 \xi_m + \frac{m \xi_m \log n}{n} \Big),$$

$\mathfrak{R}_3(\cdot)$ is defined in (S.1.5) and C_1 denotes the constant appearing in (S.1.8). By (S.1.3), (S.1.8) in Theorem S.1.1, we see that

$$P\Big(\sup_{s=1,...,S} \sup_\tau \|R^{(s)}_{n,2}(\tau)\| \neq 0 \Big) \le 2Sn^{-A}; \tag{B.1}$$

and by (S.1.8) in Theorem S.1.1,

$$\sup_\tau \|R^{(s)}_{n,3}(\tau)\| \le C_1 \xi_m \Big(g_n^2 \xi_m + \frac{m \xi_m \log n}{n} \Big). \tag{B.2}$$

Next we deal with $R^{(s)}_{n,1}(\tau)$. Consider the function $g : (\mathbb{R}^m)^S \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$g(x_1, ..., x_S) := \Big\| \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S x_s \Big\|.$$

Direct computations show that

$$|g(x_1, ..., x_S) - g(x_1, ..., x'_i, ..., x_S)| \le \frac{\|x'_i - x_i\|}{S}.$$

Note that by construction $\|R^{(s)}_{n,1}(\tau)\| \le D_n(A)$ almost surely. Apply McDiarmid's inequality (Lemma 1.2 on page 149 in McDiarmid (1989)) to $g(R^{(1)}_{n,1}(\tau), ..., R^{(S)}_{n,1}(\tau))$ to obtain for all $t > 0$

$$\sup_\tau P\Big(\Big\| \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S R^{(s)}_{n,1}(\tau) \Big\| \ge t \Big) \le 2 \exp\Big(\frac{-St^2}{2D_n^2(A)} \Big)$$

Letting $t = \sqrt{2}\kappa_n S^{-1/2} D_n(A)$ and combining this with (B.1) and (B.2) shows that

$$\sup_{\tau} P\Big(\|r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\| > \sqrt{2}\kappa_n S^{-1/2} D_n(A) + C_1 \xi_m \Big(g_n^2 \xi_m + \frac{m\xi_m \log n}{n} \Big) \Big) \leq 2Sn^{-A} + 2e^{-\kappa_n^2}.$$

Finally, from an elementary but tedious calculation and the definition of $\Re_3(A \log n)$ in (S.1.5), we obtain

$$\kappa_n S^{-1/2} \Re_3(A \log n) \lesssim A \frac{\kappa_n}{S^{1/2}} \Big(\frac{m}{n} \Big)^{1/2} \Big((\xi_m g_n \log n)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{m \xi_m^2 (\log n)^3}{n} \Big)^{1/4} \Big).$$

Thus the proof of Theorem A.1 is complete. □

B.2 Proof of Theorem A.4

The proof proceeds similarly to the proof of Theorem A.1. From Theorem S.1.2 we obtain the representation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_N^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^s(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)) = & - n^{-1} \mathbf{u}_N^\top J_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i^s (\mathbf{1}\{Y_i^s \leq (\mathbf{Z}_i^s)^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\} - \tau) + \mathbf{u}_N^\top \sum_{k=1}^4 r_{n,k}^s(\tau) \\ & + \mathbf{u}_N^\top J_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|X) - \tau)]. \end{aligned}$$

where the quantities $r_{n,j}^1(\tau), ..., r_{n,j}^S(\tau)$ are i.i.d. for each $j = 1, ..., 4$ and

$$\mathbb{G}_n^s(\psi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau), \tau)) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Y_{is}, \mathbf{Z}(X_{is}); \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau), \tau).$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{Z}(F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|X) - \tau) \\ & \quad = \mathbf{Z} f_{Y|X}(Q(X;\tau)|X)(\mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) - Q(X;\tau)) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Z} f'_{Y|X}(\zeta_n(X,\tau)|X)(\mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) - Q(X;\tau))^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta_n(X,\tau)$ is a value between $\mathbf{Z}(X)^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)$ and $Q(X;\tau)$. From the definition of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ as (3.8), we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z} f_{Y|X}(Q(X;\tau)|X)(\mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) - Q(X;\tau))] = 0$ so that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \Big| \mathbf{u}_N^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|X) - \tau)] \Big| \lesssim \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{u}_N, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) c_n^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N).$$

Letting

$$r_N^{(1)}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_N) := \Big| \frac{1}{S} \mathbf{u}_N^\top \sum_{s=1}^S \Big(r_{n,1}^s(\tau) + r_{n,2}^s(\tau) + r_{n,4}^s(\tau) \Big) + \mathbf{u}_N^\top J_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|X) - \tau)] \Big|$$

we find that the bound on $r_N^{(1)}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_N)$ is a direct consequence of Theorem S.1.2. Next, let

$$r_N^{(2)}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_N) := \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbf{u}_N^\top r_{n,3}^s(\tau).$$

Define $\widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau) := r^s_{n,3}(\tau) - \mathbb{E}[r^s_{n,3}(\tau)]$ and consider the decomposition

$$r^s_{n,3}(\tau) = \widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}\mathbf{1}\Big\{\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}|\mathbf{u}_N^\top\widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau)| \le D^{(L)}_n(A)\Big\} + \widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}|\mathbf{u}_N^\top\widetilde{r}^s_{n,3}(\tau)| > D^{(L)}_n(A)\Big\} + \mathbb{E}[r^1_{n,3}(\tau)]$$
$$=: \sum_{j=1}^{3} R^{(s)}_{n,j}(\tau)$$

where for a constant $A > 0$, and a sufficiently large constant C

$$D^{(L)}_n(A) := C\Re^{(L)}_3(A\log n) + C_1 \sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{u}_N,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(c^4_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi^2_m(\log n)^2}{n}\Big),$$

$\Re^{(L)}_3$ is defined in (S.1.12), C_1 denotes the constant appearing in (S.1.15).

By (S.1.10) in Theorem S.1.2,

$$P\Big(\sup_{s=1,\dots,S}\sup_{\tau}\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}|\mathbf{u}_N^\top R^{(s)}_{n,2}(\tau)| \neq 0\Big) \le 2Sn^{-A}. \tag{B.3}$$

Applying (S.1.15) in Theorem S.1.2 yields

$$\sup_{\tau}\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}|\mathbf{u}_N^\top R^{(s)}_{n,3}(\tau)| \le C_1 \sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{u}_N,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(c^4_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi^2_m(\log n)^2}{n}\Big). \tag{B.4}$$

Next consider he function $g : (\mathbb{R}^m)^S \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$g(x_1,...,x_S) := \sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}\Big|\mathbf{u}_N^\top\frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^{S}x_s\Big| = \Big\|\Big(\frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^{S}x_s\Big)^{(\mathcal{I})}\Big\|.$$

The reverse triangle inequality shows that

$$|g(x_1,...,x_S) - g(x_1,...,x'_i,...,x_S)| \le \sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}\frac{|\mathbf{u}_N^\top(x'_i - x_i)|}{S}.$$

Note that by construction $\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}|\mathbf{u}_N^\top R^{(s)}_{n,1}(\tau)| \le D^{(L)}_n(A)$ almost surely. Apply McDiarmid's inequality (Lemma 1.2 on page 149 in McDiarmid (1989)) to $g(R^{(1)}_{n,1}(\tau),...,R^{(S)}_{n,1}(\tau))$ to obtain for all $t > 0$

$$\sup_{\tau}P\Big(\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}\Big|\frac{1}{S}\mathbf{u}_N^\top\sum_{s=1}^{S}R^{(s)}_{n,1}(\tau)\Big| \ge t\Big) \le 2\exp\Big(\frac{-St^2}{2(D^{(L)}_n(A))^2}\Big).$$

Letting $t = \sqrt{2}\kappa_n S^{-1/2}D^{(L)}_n(A)$ and combining this with (B.3)-(B.4) shows that

$$\sup_{\tau}P\Big(\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}\Big|r^{(2)}_N(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N)\Big| > \sqrt{2}\kappa_n S^{-1/2}D^{(L)}_n(A) + C_1\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}^{m-1}_{\mathcal{I}}}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{u}_N,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(c^4_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi^2_m(\log n)^2}{n}\Big)\Big)$$
$$\le 2Sn^{-A} + 2e^{-\kappa^2_n}.$$

Thus the proof of Theorem A.4 is complete. □

C. Proofs for Section 3

C.1 Proofs for Section 3.1

The weak convergence (3.2) and the weak convergence of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ of Theorem 3.1 follow by an application of Theorem 3.8. To see that the conditions of the latter theorem are satisfied, note that for any $P \in \mathcal{P}_1$, the quantities m, ξ_m are constants that do not depend on N. Moreover, since $J_m(\tau)$ is invertible by the assumptions (A1)-(A3) of Theorem 3.1, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N \equiv \boldsymbol{\beta}$, and additionally we have $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = g_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = 0$. The other conditions of Theorem 3.8 follow from the assumption $S = o(N^{1/2}(\log N)^{-2})$.

By similar arguments, the process convergence (3.5) and the process convergence of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ in Theorem 3.2 follow from the part 1 of Theorem 3.11, while Corollary 3.3 follows from part 2 of Theorem 3.11.

It remains to prove the necessary condition on S and G, this is done in Section C.3.

C.2 Proofs for Section 3.2

C.2.1 Proof of (3.11) and the weak convergence of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ in Theorem 3.5

From Theorem S.1.2 in the supplementary material we obtain the following representation for the oracle estimator

$$\frac{\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)) = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{U}}_{1,N}(\tau) + o_P(N^{-1/2}), \tag{C.1}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{U}}_{1,N}(\tau) := -N^{-1}\frac{\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le \mathbf{Z}_i^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\} - \tau). \tag{C.2}$$

We will show that under the assumptions of Theorem S.1.2, equality (C.1) is true for the estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$. To this end, apply Theorem A.4. Under (L1) a simple computation shows that the quantities $R_{1,n}^{(L)}$ and $R_{n,2}^{(L)}$ defined in (A.13) and (A.15) of Theorem A.4 satisfy

$$R_{1,n}(A\log n) + R_{2,n}(A, A\log n) = o(N^{-1/2})$$

for any fixed constant $A > 0$. Thus we obtain from (A.12) and (A.14) that for sufficiently large n and a fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\Big(\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\Big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N)\Big\| > N^{-1/2}\Big)\\
&\le P\Big(\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\Big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N)\Big\| > N^{-1/2}\Big)\\
&\le 3Sn^{-A} + n^{-A},
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}$ is defined in (A.2). Choosing constant $A > 0$ large enough ensures that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\Big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N)\Big\| = o_P(N^{-1/2}), \tag{C.4}$$

and we obtain for every fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\frac{\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)) = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{U}}_{1,N}(\tau) + o_P(N^{-1/2}),$$

which shares the same form as (C.1), with remainder holding for a fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbf{Z}(x_0)$.

Next we shall prove that $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \big|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{U}}_{1,N}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau)\big| = o_P\big(N^{-1/2}\big)$, where

$$\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) := -N^{-1}\frac{\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}J_m(\tau)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\} - \tau). \tag{C.5}$$

This follows by similar arguments as the proof of Theorem 2.4 in Section A.2 on pages 18-21 of Chao et al. (2016), by noting that the conditions required there follow exactly by our (A1)-(A3), (L), (L1) where we use that $\xi_m^4(\log N)^6 = o(N)$, $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^2 = o(N^{-1/2})$ by (L1), and $\mathcal{I}$ and L in the statement of Theorem 2.4 of Chao et al. (2016) being the coordinates of the non-zero components of $\mathbf{Z}(x_0)$ and r, respectively.

To prove the weak convergence result for both $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\} - \tau)}{(\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}(x_0))^{1/2}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \tau(1-\tau)).$$

This follows by an application of the Lindeberg CLT. The verification of the Lindeberg condition here is a simple modification from finite dimensional joint convergence in the proof of (2.4) on page 16 in Chao et al. (2016) to pointwise convergence. □

C.2.2 Proof the (3.14) and part 2 of Theorem 3.6

We begin with a proof of (3.14). The key is to establish an equivalent of (C.36) with remainder term satisfying $\max_k |r_N(\tau_k)| = o_P(\|\mathbf{u}_N\|N^{-1/2})$. This can be done via similar argument as Section C.2.1. The difference is that, instead of (C.3), we obtain from (A.12) and (A.14) that for sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\Big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_K}\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\Big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N)\Big\| > N^{-1/2}\Big)\\
&\le \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_K} P\Big(\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\Big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N)\Big\| > N^{-1/2}\Big)\\
&\le K\big(3Sn^{-A} + n^{-A}\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}$ is defined in (A.2). Choosing constant $A > 0$ large enough ensures that

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_K}\sup_{\mathbf{u}_N\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau,\mathbf{u}_N)\big\| = o_P(N^{-1/2}). \tag{C.6}$$

Hence, by similar argument as in Section C.2.1, we have for any fixed $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\frac{\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top}{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)) = \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) + o_P(N^{-1/2}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau)$ is defined in (C.5) and the remainder term holds uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_K$. The process convergence of $\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau)$ can be argued as in Section A.1.2 of Chao et al. (2016).

The proof of the process convergence of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ follows directly by Theorem 2.4 of Chao et al. (2016). The proof of the second part follows by similar arguments as the proof of of Theorem 4.1 in Chao et al. (2016). Therefore, they are omitted for brevity. □

C.3 Proofs of necessary conditions for S, G in Secton 3.1 and Section 3.2

First, we will prove in Section C.3.1 that the oracle rule in Theorem 3.2 fails whenever $G \lesssim N^{1/(2\eta)}$ and that the oracle rule in Theorem 3.6 fail whenever $G \lesssim N^{1/(2\eta)}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-1/\eta}$, no matter how S is chosen.

Second, in Section C.3.2 we will construct a special class of data generation processes. This construction will be utilized in Section C.3.3 to prove that the oracle rules in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.5 fail if $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}$ or $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}\xi_m^{-1}$, respectively.

Third, in Section C.3.4 we will prove that, provided $G \gg N^{1/(2\eta_\tau)}$ and $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}$, the oracle rule in Theorem 3.2 fails and that, for $G \gg N^{1/(2\eta)}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-1/\eta_\tau}$ and $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}\xi_m^{-1}$, the oracle rule in Theorem 3.6 fails.

C.3.1 Sharpness of the conditions on G in Theorems 3.2 and 3.6

Fix an integer $\eta_\tau \geq 2$ and assume that $G = G_N \lesssim N^{1/(2\eta_\tau)}$. We will now prove that weak convergence in (3.5) fails for some $(P, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{P}_1(d^{1/2}, 1, \overline{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min})$, independently of the choice of S.

We begin by noting that it is possible to construct a function g on $\mathbb{R}$ with the following properties: g has support $[-1, 1]$, g is η_τ times continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$ with absolute values of all the function and derivatives bounded uniformly by 1, g does not vanish on $\mathbb{R}$. From the properties listed here it is clear that g is not a polynomial and hence, $d_{r_\tau} := \inf_{p\in\mathcal{P}_{r_\tau}} \sup_{x\in[-1,1]} |g(x)-p(x)| > 0$ for any fixed $r_\tau \geq \eta_\tau$ and $r_\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathcal{P}_{r_\tau}$ is the space of polynomials of degree r_τ.

We now construct a function Q on $\mathcal{T} = [\tau_L, \tau_U]$ that is a proper quantile function with the following properties: the corresponding distribution function F is twice continuously differentiable, its density f satisfies (A2)-(A3) and there exists a subsequence N_k and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all k

$$G_{N_k}^{\eta_\tau} \inf_{p\in\mathcal{PP}_{r_\tau}(G_{N_k})} \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |Q(\tau) - p(\tau)| \geq \varepsilon, \tag{C.7}$$

where $\mathcal{PP}_{r_\tau}(G_N)$ is the set of piecewise polynomials of degree r_τ defined on a the equally spaced grid $\tau_L = t_{1,N} < ... < t_{G_N,N} = \tau_U$. Begin by considering the case $\limsup_{N\to\infty} G_N = \infty$. Pick a subsequence N_k of N and a sequence of integers $\nu_k \leq G_{N_k}$ such that

$$I_k := \Big[\tau_L + \frac{\nu_k(\tau_U - \tau_L)}{G_{N_k}}, \tau_L + \frac{(\nu_k + 1)(\tau_U - \tau_L)}{G_{N_k}}\Big] \subset \Big(\tau_L + (\tau_U - \tau_L)\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} 2^{-j}, \tau_L + (\tau_U - \tau_L)\sum_{j=1}^{k} 2^{-j}\Big).$$

By construction, the intervals I_k are mutually disjoint and each interval is contained between two adjacent knots in the grid $t_{1,N_k}, ..., t_{G_{N_k},N_k}$.

Define for some $a, c > 0$ (specified later):

$$Q(\tau) := a\tau + c\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(2G_{N_k})^{-\eta_\tau} g(2G_{N_k}(\tau - s_k)/(\tau_U - \tau_L)) \tag{C.8}$$

where s_k denotes the midpoint of I_k. Note that by construction the supports of $\tau \mapsto g(2G_{N_k}(\tau - s_k)/(\tau_U - \tau_L))$ do not overlap for different k, so for each fixed τ only one summand in the sum above does not vanish. Moreover, again by construction, the support of $\tau \mapsto g(2G_{N_k}(\tau - s_k)/(\tau_U - \tau_L))$ is contained between two knots of the form $(\tau_U - \tau_L)\nu_k/G_{N_k}, (\tau_U - \tau_L)(\nu_k + 1)/G_{N_k}$ for some $\nu_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, (C.8) implies that

$$\inf_{p \in \mathcal{PP}_{r_\tau}(G_{N_k})} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |Q(\tau) - p(\tau)| \geq c(2G_{N_k})^{-\eta_\tau} d_{r_\tau}. \tag{C.9}$$

Suppose now that $\limsup_{N\to\infty} G_N < \infty$. Since in this case G_N is a bounded sequence of natural numbers, it must take at least one value, say N_0, infinitely often. Let $s := \tau_L + (\tau_U - \tau_L)/(2G_{N_0})$. Define for $a, c > 0$,

$$Q(\tau) := a\tau + c(2G_{N_0})^{-\eta_\tau} g(2G_{N_0}(\tau - s)/(\tau_U - \tau_L)). \tag{C.10}$$

Similar to (C.9), we have for $N_k \equiv N_0$

$$\inf_{p \in \mathcal{PP}_{r_\tau}(G_{N_k})} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |Q(\tau) - p(\tau)| \geq c(2G_{N_k})^{-\eta_\tau} d_{r_\tau}. \tag{C.11}$$

Simple computations show that for the Q defined in (C.8) or (C.10) $\sup_\tau |Q'(\tau)| \leq a + c, \sup_\tau |Q''(\tau)| \leq c, \inf_\tau Q'(\tau) \geq a - c$. Hence $a, c > 0$ can be chosen such that (A2)-(A3) hold for $F = Q^{-1}$. Thus we have established (C.7).

Now let $P(X_1 = m^{1/2}\mathbf{e}_j) = 1/m$ for $j = 1, ..., m$ and let $\mathbf{Z}(x) \equiv x$ and assume $X_1, ..., X_N$ are i.i.d. Let $Y_1, ..., Y_N$ be independent of $\{X_i\}_{1=1,...,N}$ and have quantile function Q for which (C.7) holds and (A2)-(A3) hold for $F = Q^{-1}$. To simplify notation, assume that (C.7) holds with $N \equiv N_k$. Observe that by definition $\tau \mapsto \widehat{\beta}_j(\tau) \in \mathcal{PP}_{r_\tau}(G_N)$ for any $j = 1, ..., d$, where we recall that $\mathbf{B}(\tau)$ is a vector of B-spline basis with degree r_τ. Thus we have almost surely for all N

$$G_N^{\eta_\tau} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\widehat{\beta}_j(\tau) - \beta_j(\tau)| \geq G_N^{\eta_\tau} \inf_{p \in \mathcal{PP}_{r_\tau}(G_{N_k})} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |p(\tau) - Q(\tau)| \geq \varepsilon > 0. \tag{C.12}$$

Note that (C.12) holds regardless of the number of groups S. Now, since $G_N \lesssim N^{1/(2\eta_\tau)}$, we have $C := \sup_{N \geq 1} G_N^{\eta_\tau}/N^{1/2} < \infty$ and thus (C.12) implies that for all N

$$N^{1/2} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\widehat{\beta}_j(\tau) - \beta_j(\tau)| \geq \varepsilon/C > 0 \quad a.s. \tag{C.13}$$

Now assume that the weak convergence (3.5) holds. We have by the continuous mapping theorem

$$\sqrt{N} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\widehat{\beta}_j(\tau) - \beta_j(\tau)| \rightsquigarrow \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{G}(\tau)|, \tag{C.14}$$

where $\mathbb{G}$ is a tight, centered Gaussian process with continuous sample paths. By the arguments given on pages 60-61 of Ledoux and Talagrand (1991), it follows that $\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{G}(\tau)|$ has a continuous

distribution with left support point zero, and thus $P(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}|\mathbb{G}(\tau)|<\delta)>0$ for all $\delta>0$. This also implies that $[\varepsilon/(2C),\infty)$ is a continuity set of the distribution of $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}|\mathbb{G}(\tau)|$, and thus the weak convergence together with the Portmonteau Theorem implies that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}P\Big(\sqrt{N}\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}|\widehat{\beta}_j(\tau)-\beta_j(\tau)|\geq\varepsilon/(2C)\Big)=P\Big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}|\mathbb{G}(\tau)|\geq\varepsilon/(2C)\Big)<1.$$

This contradicts (C.13), and thus the weak convergence (3.5) can not hold. Arguments for the case in Theorem 3.6 with increasing m are similar as above, except that the rate of weak convergence in (C.14) is $\sqrt{N}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-1}$, and $G_N\lesssim N^{1/(2\eta_\tau)}\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|^{-1/\eta_\tau}$. □

C.3.2 A special class of data generation processes

Consider a family of quantile functions $Q_{a,b}(\tau)=a\tau^2+b\tau$, $\tau\in(0,1)$ indexed by $a\geq 0, b>0$. The corresponding distribution functions $F_{a,b}$ have support $[0,a+b]$ and take the form

$$F_{a,b}(y)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{2a}(-b+(b^2+4ay)^{1/2}), & a>0,b>0;\\ \frac{y}{b}, & a=0,b>0.\end{cases}\tag{C.15}$$

Note that the first two derivatives of the function $F_{a,b}$ defined in (C.15) are

$$F'_{a,b}(y)=(b^2+4ay)^{-1/2},\quad F''_{a,b}(y)=-2a(b^2+4ay)^{-3/2}$$

and in particular

$$\inf_{y\in[0,a+b]}F'_{a,b}(y)\geq(b+2a)^{-1}\qquad\sup_{y\in[0,a+b]}|F'_{a,b}(y)|\leq b^{-1},\qquad\sup_{y\in[0,a+b]}|F''_{a,b}(y)|\leq 2ab^{-3}.$$

Choosing $b=1/\overline{f}$ and a such that

$$0\leq 2a<\Big(1/f_{min}-1/\overline{f}\Big)\wedge\Big(\overline{f'}(\overline{f})^{-3}\Big)\tag{C.16}$$

ensures that

$$\inf_{y\in[0,a+b]}F'_{a,b}(y)\geq f_{min},\qquad\sup_{y\in[0,a+b]}|F'_{a,b}(y)|\leq\overline{f},\qquad\sup_{y\in[0,a+b]}|F''_{a,b}(y)|\leq\overline{f'}.\tag{C.17}$$

Let $Y_1,...,Y_n$ be i.i.d. with distribution function $F_{a,b}$ and $X_1,...,X_n$ i.i.d., independent of $Y_1,...,Y_n$, and such that $P(X_1=\mathbf{e}_j\sqrt{m})=1/m, j=1,...,m$ where $\mathbf{e}_j\in\mathbb{R}^m$ denotes the jth unit vector. In this model, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n\rho_\tau(Y_i-\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top X_i)=\sum_{j=1}^m\sum_{i:X_i=\mathbf{e}_j}\rho_\tau(Y_i-\sqrt{m}\beta_j).$$

Define $\mathcal{A}_j:=\{i:X_i=\mathbf{e}_j\}$, $n_j:=\#\mathcal{A}_j$. Letting

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)=\operatorname*{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathbb{R}^m}\sum_{i=1}^n\rho_\tau(Y_i-\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top X_i)\tag{C.18}$$

we find that $\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)=\operatorname{argmin}_{b\in\mathbb{R}}\sum_{i:X_i=\mathbf{e}_j}\rho_\tau(Y_i-\sqrt{m}b)$, and by p.9 in Koenker (2005) the solution of this minimization problem with smallest absolute value is $\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)=m^{-1/2}Y^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}\mathbf{1}\{n_j>0\}$ where

$Y^j_{(k)}$ is the k-th order statistic of the sample $\{Y_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{A}_j}$ and $\lceil u\rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater or equal u.

Now assume that m, n, K, G are sequences of positive integers indexed by $N \to \infty$ such that $n \geq 2, m \leq n, n = N/S$ for an integer S.

In Section S.2. of the online Appendix we shall prove the following facts about $\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)$ defined above

1. For any fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $b > 0$ and any $a_{max} > 0$ there exists $a \in [0, a_{max}]$ such that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}[m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)] - Q_{a,b}(\tau)\Big| > 0 \tag{C.19}$$

$$\frac{n}{m}\mathrm{Var}(m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)) \lesssim 1 \tag{C.20}$$

2. Assume that $G \gg (N/m)^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$ and $N/m \geq 1$. Let $\check{\beta}_j(\tau) := \sum_{k=1}^K A_k(\tau_k)\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k)$ where

$$A_k(\tau) := \mathbf{B}(\tau)^\top \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\mathbf{B}(\tau_k)^\top\right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(\tau_k), \tag{C.21}$$

and we recall that $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, ..., B_q)^\top$ where $\{B_1, ..., B_q\}$ B-spline basis with equidistant knots $\tau_L = t_1 < ... < t_G = \tau_U$ and degree $r_\tau \geq \eta_\tau$. For any closed interval $\mathcal{T}_0 \subset \mathcal{T}$ with non-empty interior and any $a_{max}, b > 0$ there exists $a \in [0, a_{max}]$ and a sequence τ_N in $\mathcal{T}_0$ such that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}[m^{1/2}\check{\beta}_j(\tau_N)] - Q_{a,b}(\tau_N)\Big| > 0 \tag{C.22}$$

$$\frac{n}{m}\mathrm{Var}(m^{1/2}\check{\beta}_j(\tau_N)) \lesssim 1. \tag{C.23}$$

C.3.3 Failure of oracle rules in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.5

Fix an arbitrary $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Let $Y_1, ..., Y_N$ be i.i.d. with distribution function $F_{a,b}$ defined in (C.15) and independent of $X_1, ..., X_N$ where X_i i.i.d. with $P(X_1 = \mathbf{e}_j\sqrt{m}) = 1/m, j = 1, ..., m$. Let $\mathbf{Z}(x) := x$. Define $b = 1/\overline{f}$ and pick a satisfying (C.16) such that (C.19)-(C.20) hold.

We begin by considering the case where $m = d$ is fixed. Denote by P the measure corresponding to X_1, Y_1. Due to the choice of a, b and the distribution of X the pair $(\mathbf{Z}, P)$ is an element of $\mathcal{P}_1(d^{1/2}, 1, \overline{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min})$. Moreover, by construction, $\{\widehat{\beta}^s_j(\tau)\}_{s=1,...,S}$ are i.i.d. and $\widehat{\beta}^1_j(\tau)$ has the same distribution as $\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)$ defined in (C.18). Thus (3.4) is a direct consequence of (C.19).

Next, we shall prove that (3.2) fails for $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}_1$. Given (C.20), a simple computation shows that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\sqrt{N}(\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - \mathbb{E}[\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)]))^2] = \frac{N}{S}\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\beta}_1(\tau)) = n\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\beta}_1(\tau)) \lesssim 1 \tag{C.24}$$

for any fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Thus the sequence $\sqrt{N}(\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - \mathbb{E}[\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)])$ is uniformly integrable.

Now assume that the weak convergence in (3.2) holds with $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{e}_1$. By (C.19) we know that for $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}$ and any fixed $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}[\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)] - \beta_1(\tau)\Big| \gtrsim 1/n = S/N \gtrsim N^{-1/2}. \tag{C.25}$$

If $\left|\mathbb{E}[\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)] - \beta_1(\tau)\right| \asymp N^{-1/2}$, uniform integrability of $\sqrt{N}(\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - \mathbb{E}[\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)])$ implies uniform integrability of $\sqrt{N}(\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - \beta_1(\tau))$. In that case (3.2) implies $\mathbb{E}[\sqrt{N}(\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - \beta_1(\tau))] \to 0$ by Theorem 25.12 on p.338 of Billingsley (1995), which contradicts (C.25).

If $\left|\mathbb{E}[\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)] - \beta_1(\tau)\right| \gg N^{-1/2}$, (C.24) implies that $N\mathbb{E}[(\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - \beta_1(\tau))^2] \to \infty$, and thus $\sqrt{N}\left|\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - \beta_1(\tau)\right|$ diverges to infinity in probability, which contradicts (3.2)

Now consider the setting of Section 3.2 where $m \to \infty$. With the choice of X described in Section C.3.2 we have $\xi_m = m^{1/2}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) = m^{-1/2}Q_{a,b}(\tau)(1, ..., 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = 0$. The matrix $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]$ is the $m \times m$ identity matrix while $J_m(\tau), \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))$ are diagonal with entries bounded away from zero and infinity. A simple computation shows that (L) holds with $r = 1$. Denote by P_N the sequence of measures corresponding to X_i, Y_i. Picking m such that $m^2(\log N)^6 = o(N)$ ensures that $(\mathbf{Z}, P_N)$ lies in $\mathcal{P}_L(1, \overline{f}, \overline{f'}, f_{min}, R)$ for any $R \geq 1$. Letting $x_0 = \mathbf{Z}(x_0) = \mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ the weak convergence in (3.11) takes the form

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{m}}(m^{1/2}\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - Q_{a,b}(\tau)) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma(\tau))$$

for some constant $\sigma(\tau)$. Moreover, (C.20) yields

$$\mathbb{E}[(\sqrt{N}m^{-1/2}(m^{1/2}\overline{\beta}_1(\tau) - m^{1/2}\mathbb{E}[\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)]))^2] = \frac{N}{Sm}\mathrm{Var}(m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_1(\tau)) = \frac{n}{m}\mathrm{Var}(m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_1(\tau)) \lesssim 1$$

while (C.19) implies that for $S \gtrsim N^{1/2}/m^{1/2} = N^{1/2}\xi_m^{-1}$

$$\left|\mathbb{E}[m^{1/2}\overline{\beta}_1(\tau)] - Q_{a,b}(\tau)\right| \gtrsim m/n = mS/N \gtrsim m^{1/2}N^{-1/2}.$$

Now (3.12) and failure of weak convergence in (3.11) can be established for $x_0 = \mathbf{Z}(x_0) = \mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ by exactly the same arguments as given in the first part of the proof for the fixed m case, details are omitted for the sake of brevity.

C.3.4 Failure of oracle rules in Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.6

Fix a subset $\mathcal{T}_0 \subset \mathcal{T}$ which is closed and has non-empty interior. Let $Y_1, ..., Y_N$ be i.i.d. with distribution function $F_{a,b}$ defined in (C.15) and independent of $X_1, ..., X_N$ where X_i i.i.d. with $P(X_1 = \mathbf{e}_j\sqrt{m}) = 1/m, j = 1, ..., m$. Let $b = 1/\overline{f}$ and pick a satisfying (C.16) and a sequence τ_N in $\mathcal{T}_0$ such that (C.22)-(C.23) hold. Since τ_N is a sequence in a compact set, it must have a convergent subsequence $\tau_{N_k} \to \tau_0 \in \mathcal{T}_0$. From now on, we will without loss of generality assume that $N = N_k$.

Assume that (3.5) holds. Process convergence in (3.5), along with the continuity of the sample paths of the limiting processes, implies that $\sqrt{N}(m^{1/2}\widehat{\beta}_1(\tau_N) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_N))$ converges to a centered normal random variable. This can be led to a contradiction with (C.22)-(C.23) by similar arguments as in Section C.3.3 after observing that by definition $\widehat{\beta}_1(\tau) = S^{-1}\sum_{s=1}^S \check{\beta}_1(\tau)$.

The proof that (3.14) fails can be done similarly, and details are omitted for the sake of brevity.

C.4 Proofs for Section 3.3

Recall the definition of $g_N(\mathbf{b}_N)$ in (A.4) and $c_m(\mathbf{b}_N)$ in (3.9). As mentioned in Remark 3.12, the results in Section 3.3 hold for general 'centerings' $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ provided that certain technical

conditions are satisfied. The precise form of those conditions is discussed in section C.4.1. There, we show that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ satisfies those general conditions. In sections C.4.2 and C.4.4, all theoretical results will be proved for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ under the general conditions described in section C.4.1. The results with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ in Section 3.3 follow as a special case.

C.4.1 Details of Remark 3.12

Assume that (A1)-(A3) hold. Theorem 3.8 holds for any sequence of centering coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$ under the following conditions: $S = o(N^{1/2}/(m\xi_m^2(\log N)^2))$, $Sc_m^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)m\log N = o(1)$, and

(B1) $g_N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = o(N^{-1/2})$ and $m^4(\log N)^{10} + m^2\xi_m^4 = o(N)$.

(B2) $mc_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\log N = o(1)$ and the sequence $\mathbf{u}_N$ (in Theorem 3.8) satisfies

$$\chi_N(\mathbf{u}_N, \boldsymbol{\beta}_N) := \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \left|\mathbf{u}_N^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbf{Z}_i\big(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\} - \mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le \mathbf{Z}_i^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\}\big)\big]\right| = o(\|\mathbf{u}_N\|N^{-1/2}).$$

Furthermore, Theorem 3.11 holds under the additional restriction $c_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = o(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|N^{-1/2})$ and the other conditions on Q, G, K stated in Theorem 3.11.

In the sequel, we verify that, assuming the conditions stated in Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.11 respectively, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ satisfies the conditions given above. Note that some conditions in these theorems overlap with the conditions stated above, so we only need to verify that the conditions $c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\xi_m = o(N^{-1/2})$ and $S = o(N^{1/2}/(m\xi_m^2(\log N)^2))$ in both theorems imply $g_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(N^{-1/2})$, $\chi_N(\mathbf{u}_N, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(\|\mathbf{u}_N\|N^{-1/2})$, $Sc_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)m\log N = o(1)$ and $mc_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\log N = o(1)$.

Under the definition of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ in (3.8) and (A1)-(A3), we have $g_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = O(\xi_m c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N))$. To see this, note that under (A2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{Z}(F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|X) - \tau)\\
&= \mathbf{Z}f_{Y|X}(Q(X;\tau)|X)(\mathbf{Z}^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) - Q(X;\tau)) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}f'_{Y|X}(\zeta_n(X,\tau)|X)(\mathbf{Z}^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) - Q(X;\tau))^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{C.26}$$

where $\zeta_n(X,\tau)$ is a value between $\mathbf{Z}(X)^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)$ and $Q(X;\tau)$. Thus

$$g_n(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\left\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}(F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|X) - \tau)]\right\| \le \frac{\overline{f'}c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^2}{2}\|\mathbf{Z}\| = O(\xi_m c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)), \tag{C.27}$$

where the second inequality follows from the first order condition $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}f_{Y|X}(Q(X;\tau)|X)(\mathbf{Z}^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) - Q(X;\tau))] = 0$ by the definition of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ in (3.8) and (C.26). Moreover,

$$\chi_N(\mathbf{u}_N, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\left|\mathbf{u}_N^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mu(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau),\tau)\right| \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_N\|_2 g_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N).$$

Hence, $c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\xi_m = o(N^{-1/2})$ implies $g_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(N^{-1/2})$ and $\chi_N(\mathbf{u}_N, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(\|\mathbf{u}_N\|N^{-1/2})$. In addition,

$$Sc_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)m\log N = o(SN^{-1/2}\xi_m^{-1}m\log N) = o(1),$$

where the first equality is from $c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\xi_m = o(N^{-1/2})$ and the second from $S = o(N^{1/2}/(m\xi_m^2(\log N)^2))$. Finally

$$mc_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\log N = o(mN^{-1/4}\log N) = o((m^4N^{-1}(\log N)^4)^{1/4}) = o(1)$$

where the first bound follows from $c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\xi_m = o(N^{-1/2}), \xi_m \gtrsim 1$ and the third bound from $m^4(\log N)^{10} = o(N)$.

□

C.4.2 Proof of Theorem 3.8

In this section we will prove the weak convergence of $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ for models with centering coefficient $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)$ from a class specified in Section C.4.1. It is also explained there that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)$ lies in this class.

From Theorem S.1.1 in the supplementary material, we obtain the following representation for the oracle estimator

$$\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)) = -\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le \mathbf{Z}_i^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\} - \tau) + o_P(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|N^{-1/2}). \tag{C.28}$$

Next, we will show that under the assumptions in Section C.4.1, the same is true for the estimator $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$. To this end, apply Theorem A.1. Under (B1), a simple computation shows that the quantities $R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}$ defined in (A.6) and (A.8) of Theorem A.1 satisfy

$$R_{1,n}(A\log n) + R_{2,n}(A, A\log n) = o(N^{-1/2})$$

for any fixed $A > 0$. Thus we obtain from (A.5) and (A.7) that for sufficiently large n and a fixed τ,

$$\begin{aligned} P\big(\big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\big\| > N^{-1/2}\big) &\le P\big(\big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\big\| > N^{-1/2}\big) \\ &\le 3Sn^{-A} + n^{-A}. \end{aligned} \tag{C.29}$$

Choosing A large enough ensures that

$$\big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\big\| = o_P(N^{-1/2}), \tag{C.30}$$

and we obtain

$$\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)) = -\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le \mathbf{Z}_i^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\} - \tau) + o_P(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|N^{-1/2}).$$

Next we shall prove that for all $\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\Big|\mathbf{u}_N^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\} - \mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le \mathbf{Z}_i^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\})\Big| = o_P(\|\mathbf{u}_N\|_2/\sqrt{N}). \tag{C.31}$$

This follows by similar arguments as the proof of equation (2.2) in Section A.1.1 on pages 15-16 in Chao et al. (2016), by noting that the conditions required there follow exactly by our (A1)-(A3),

(B1), (B2) where we use that $mc_m \log N = o(1)$ by (B2) and $m^4(\log N)^{10} + m^2\xi_m^4 = o(N)$ in (B1) (which implies $m^3\xi_m^2(\log N)^3 = o(N)$).

Hence to prove the weak convergence result for both $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\}-\tau)}{(\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}(x_0))^{1/2}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0,\tau(1-\tau)).$$

This follows by an application of the Lindeberg CLT. The verification of the Lindeberg condition here is a simple modification from finite dimensional joint convergence in the proof of (2.4) on page 16 in Chao et al. (2016) to pointwise convergence. □

C.4.3 Details for Remark 3.10

In the proof below, we will use the notations in Example 3.4: polynomial spline $\widetilde{B}_j$, jth knot t_j and the degree q.

We first verify (A1). The bounded spectrum $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top]$ follows by the argument in Example 3.4. We note that every univariate polynomial spline function satisfies $|\widetilde{B}_j| \le C$ almost surely for some constant $C > 0$ for all $j \le m$. Moreover, the support of $\widetilde{B}_j$ and $\widetilde{B}_k$ is disjoint unless $|j-k| \le q+1$. Hence, we have almost surely

$$\|\mathbf{Z}_i\| = m^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{k-q-1}\widetilde{B}_j(X_i)^2\Big)^{1/2} \lesssim m^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{k-q-1}\mathbf{1}\{t_j \le X_i \le t_{j+q+1}\}\Big)^{1/2} \lesssim m^{1/2}. \tag{C.32}$$

On the other hand, since each $\widetilde{B}_j(X_i)$ is nonzero almost surely, $\|\mathbf{Z}_i\| \gtrsim m^{1/2}$ and $\xi_m \asymp m^{1/2}$.

We now verify the sufficient conditions of Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.8 under the conditions made in this remark. Condition (L) holds given the discussion in Example 3.4. (L1) and the conditions $\xi_m^4(\log N)^6 = o(N), c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) = o(N^{-1/2})$ hold under the assumptions of this remark. On the other hand, the sufficient conditions of Theorem 3.8 can be easily verified by the assumptions of this remark since $\xi_m \asymp m^{1/2}$.

C.4.4 Proof of Theorem 3.11

Similar to Section C.4.2, we will prove the weak convergence of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ in models with centering coefficient $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)$ from a class specified in Section C.4.1.

The process convergence of $\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{or}(\tau)$ in the first part is exactly Theorem 2.1 of Chao et al. (2016) and therefore the proof is omitted. We begin with a proof of (3.16). The key is to prove the following representation

$$\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)) = -\frac{1}{N}\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\}-\tau) + o_P\Big(\frac{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}{N^{1/2}}\Big) \tag{C.33}$$

where the remainder is uniform in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_K$. The statement of part 1 of Theorem 3.11 can be deduced by the weak convergence of the first term on the right hand side of (C.33), as argued in Section A.1.2 of Chao et al. (2016).

To prove (C.33), consider the empirical L^2 product corresponding to the grid $\mathcal{T}_K$ defined through

$$\langle f_1, f_2\rangle_K = K^{-1}\sum_{k=1}^{K} f_1(\tau_k)f_2(\tau_k), \quad \forall f_1, f_2 \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{T}).$$

Define $\Pi_K f$ as the projection, with respect to $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_K$, of a function $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{T})$ onto Θ_G, where Θ_G is the space of splines over the grid $t_1, ..., t_G$ on $\mathcal{T} = [\tau_L, \tau_U] \subset (0,1)$ with the degree of each spline being r_τ.

From similar steps in the proof of Theorem 3.8 in Section C.4.2, we obtain the following representation

$$\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)) = -N^{-1}\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top J_m(\tau)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\} - \tau) + o_P(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|N^{-1/2}) \tag{C.34}$$

with remainder holding uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_K$. To see this, we only need to replace (C.29) in the proof of Theorem 3.8 by

$$\begin{aligned} P\big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_K}\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\| > N^{-1/2}\big) &\le \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_K} P\big(\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\| > N^{-1/2}\big) \\ &\le K\big(3Sn^{-A} + n^{-A}\big), \end{aligned}$$

and we can choose A large enough so that

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_K}\big\|r_N^{(1)}(\tau) + r_N^{(2)}(\tau)\big\| = o_P(N^{-1/2}). \tag{C.35}$$

For $k = 1, ..., K$, let $\bar{h}(\tau_k) := \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau_k)$. From (C.34) we obtain that

$$\bar{h}(\tau_k) = Q(x_0;\tau_k) + \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau_k) + r_{N,1}(\tau_k) + r_{N,2}(\tau_k), \quad k = 1, ..., K, \tag{C.36}$$

where $r_{N,1}$ is the remainder in the representation (C.34), $r_{N,2}(\tau) = \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) - Q(x_0;\tau)$, and

$$\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) := -N^{-1}J_m(\tau)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le Q(X_i;\tau)\} - \tau). \tag{C.37}$$

By definition of $r_{N,1}$ we obtain from (C.34) that $\max_{k\le K}|r_{N,1}(\tau_k)| = o_P(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|N^{-1/2})$. Denote by $\widetilde{r}_N(\tau)$ the linear interpolation corresponding to the points $(\tau_1, r_N(\tau_1)), ..., (\tau_K, r_N(\tau_K))$, where $r_N = r_{N,1} + r_{N,2}$, and let

$$\bar{h}(\tau) := Q(x_0;\tau) + \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) + \widetilde{r}_N(\tau) \tag{C.38}$$

for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Note that $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}|\widetilde{r}_N(\tau)| \le \max_{k\le K}|r_N(\tau)|$. Now Lemma 2.1 of Huang (2003) implies that $\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) = (\Pi_K\bar{h})(\tau)$. It follows from (C.38) that (note that Π_K is linear)

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - Q(x_0;\tau) - \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) \\ &= \big\{\Pi_K Q(x_0;\cdot) - Q(x_0;\cdot) + \Pi_K\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\boldsymbol{U}_N(\cdot) - \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top\boldsymbol{U}_N(\cdot) + \Pi_K\widetilde{r}_N(\cdot)\big\}(\tau). \end{aligned} \tag{C.39}$$

The statement of (C.33) follows once we show that the right hand side of (C.39) is of order $o_P(\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|N^{-1/2})$. This will be done in two steps.

Step 1: $\|\Pi_K\|_\infty := \sup_{\|f\|_\infty=1} \|\Pi_K f\|_\infty < C$ **for a constant** $C > 0$ **independent of** K**.**
We will apply Theorem A.1 of Huang (2003), and for that we need to validate conditions A.1-A.3 of Huang (2003). Note that *none* of these conditions is associated with the functions being projected on the spline space – all conditions are associated with the design and the selection of basis functions.

We first show that Condition A.1 of Huang (2003) holds in our context. By the definition of grids $t_1, ..., t_G$ and $\tau_1, ..., \tau_K$, each interval $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ contains $c_{k,K}$ spaced grid points of the form $\tau_U + l(\tau_L - \tau_U)/K$. Hence, applying Lemma S.2.2, we obtain for $j = 0, ..., G-1$ and any $f \in \Theta_G$

$$K^{-1} \sum_{k:\tau_k \in (t_j, t_{j+1}]} f^2(\tau_k) \leq \Big(1 + \frac{C_{r_\tau}}{c_{j,K} - 1}\Big) \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} f^2(x)dx,$$

and

$$K^{-1} \sum_{k:\tau_k \in (t_j, t_{j+1}]} f^2(\tau_k) \geq \Big(1 - \frac{C_{r_\tau}}{c_{j,K} - 1}\Big) \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} f^2(x)dx,$$

for a constant C_{r_τ} that depends only on r_τ. Since $\min_{k=1,...,K} c_{j,K} \to \infty$ it follows that for sufficiently large K Condition A.1 of Huang (2003) holds with $\gamma_1 = 1/2$ and $\gamma_2 = 2$.

Conditions A.2 (i) and (ii) of Huang (2003) easily follow from the fact that $\mathcal{T}$ is bounded. Finally, the definition of the knots ensures that A.2 (iii) in Huang (2003) holds. Condition A.3 holds since B-spline basis is used in the projection procedure, cf. the discussion following Condition A.3 on page 1630 of Huang (2003).

Thus conditions A.1-A.3 in Huang (2003) are satisfied, and Theorem A.1 of Huang (2003) shows the existence of a constant C such that $\|\Pi_K f\|_\infty \leq C\|f\|_\infty$ for all functions $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{T})$.

Step 2. Obtaining the rate.
Applying the results in step 1, there exists a constant C independent from K such that $\|\Pi_K \widetilde{r}_N\|_\infty \leq C\|\widetilde{r}_N\|_\infty$, and from the definition of $\widetilde{r}_N$ we see that $\|\widetilde{r}_N\|_\infty = o_P(\mathbf{Z}(x_0)N^{-1/2})$.

Next, note that by assumption, $Q(x_0; \cdot) \in \Lambda_c^\eta(\mathcal{T})$. Applying Theorem 2.62 and Theorem 6.25 of Schumaker (1981), we find that

$$\inf_{g \in \Theta_G} \|Q(x_0; \cdot) - g\|_\infty \lesssim G^{-\eta}, \tag{C.40}$$

where Θ_G is defined in the beginning of Section C.4.4. This together with Lemma 5.1 of Huang (2003) shows that

$$\|\Pi_K Q(x_0; \cdot) - Q(x_0; \cdot)\|_\infty = O(G^{-\eta}). \tag{C.41}$$

Finally, it remains to bound the term $(\Pi_K \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N)(\tau) - \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau)$. From Lemma 5.1 of Huang (2003) we obtain that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \big|(\Pi_K \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N)(\tau) - \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau)\big| \leq C \inf_{\widetilde{f} \in \Theta_G} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) - \widetilde{f}(\tau)|, \tag{C.42}$$

where C is an absolute constant. The right hand side of (C.42) can be related to the *modulus of continuity*. Indeed, using Theorem 6.27 of Schumaker (1981) we have for an absolute constant $C > 0$,

$$\inf_{\widetilde{f}\in\Theta_G}\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\left|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) - \widetilde{f}(\tau)\right| \leq C \sup_{\tau,\tau'\in\mathcal{T},|\tau-\tau'|\leq\delta} |\mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau) - \mathbf{Z}(x_0)^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau')| = o_P\Big(\frac{\|\mathbf{Z}(x_0)\|}{N^{1/2}}\Big), \tag{C.43}$$

where $\delta = \max_{0\leq j\leq k}(\tau_{j+1} - \tau_2)$, and the last equality follows from Lemma S.2.1. Hence, combining the bounds (C.41), (C.43) and the fact that $\|\Pi_K \widetilde{r}_N\|_\infty \leq C\|\widetilde{r}_N\|_\infty = o_P(\|\mathbf{u}_N\|N^{-1/2})$ with (C.39), the proof of the first part of Theorem 3.11 is complete.

The proof of the second part follows by similar arguments as the proof of of Theorem 4.1 in Chao et al. (2016), and is therefore omitted for brevity. □

References

Banerjee, M., Durot, C., and Sen, B. (2016). Divide and conquer in non-standard problems and the super-efficiency phenomenon. *ArXiv Preprint arXiv:1605.04446*.

Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., and Fernández-Val, I. (2016). Conditional quantile processes based on series or many regressors. arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.6154.

Billingsley, P. (1995). *Probability and Measure*. Wiley.

Chao, S., Volgushev, S., and Cheng, G. (2016). Quantile process for semi and nonparametric regression models. *ArXiv Preprint Arxiv 1604.02130*.

Cheng, G. and Shang, Z. (2015). Computation limits of divide-and-conquer method. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:1512.09226*.

Chernozhukov, V., Fernández-Val, I., and Galichon, A. (2010). Quantile and probability curves without crossing. *Econometrica*, 78(3):1093–1125.

Falk, M. (1999). A simple approach to the generation of uniformly distributed random variables with prescribed correlation. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 28(3):785–791.

Huang, J. Z. (2003). Local asymptotics for polynomial spline regression. *Annals of Statistics*, 31(5):1600–1635.

Jordan, M. I. (2013). On statistics, computation and scalability. *Bernoulli*, 19(4):1378–1390.

Koenker, R. (2005). *Quantile Regression*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Koltchinskii, V. (2006). Local Rademacher complexities and oracle inequalities in risk minimization. *Annals of Statistics*, 34(6):2593–2656.

Ledoux, M. and Talagrand, M. (1991). Probability in banach spaces, volume 23 of ergebnisse der mathematik und ihrer grenzgebiete (3)[results in mathematics and related areas (3)].

Li, R., Lin, D. K. J., and Li, B. (2012). Statistical inference in massive data sets. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 29:399–409.

Massart, P. (2000). About the constants in Talagrand's concentration inequalities for empirical processes. *Annals of Probability*, pages 863–884.

McDiarmid, C. (1989). On the method of bounded differences. In Siemons, J., editor, *Surveys in Combinatorics*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 141, pages 148–188. Cambridge University Press.

Schumaker, L. (1981). *Spline Functions: Basic Theory*. Wiley, New York.

Shi, C., Lu, W., and Song, R. (2016). A massive data framework for M-estimators with cubic-rate. *ArXiv Preprint arXiv:1605.07249*.

Volgushev, S. (2013). Smoothed quantile regression processes for binary response models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.5644*.

White, T. (2012). *Hadoop: The Definitive Guide*. O'Reilly Media / Yahoo Press.

Zhang, Y., Duchi, J., and Wainwright, M. J. (2013). Communication-efficient algorithms for statistical optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14:3321–3363.

Zhang, Y., Duchi, J., and Wainwright, M. J. (2015). Divide and conquer kernel ridge regression: A distributed algorithm with minimax optimal rates. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16:3299–3340.

Zhao, T., Cheng, G., and Liu, H. (2016). A partially linear framework for massive heterogeneous data. *Annals of Statistics*, 44(4):1400–1437.

Zhou, S., Shen, X., and Wolfe, D. (1998). Local asymptotics for regression splines and confidence regions. *Annals of Statistics*, 26(5):1760–1782.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL: Distributed inference for quantile regression processes

In this supplemental material, we provide the auxiliary proofs needed in the appendices. Section S.1 develops the technicalities for Bahadur representations. Section S.2 include some empirical process results, an process equicontinuity result, and a norm stability property of polynomial splines.

S.1. Refined Bahadur representations for sub-samples and their proofs

In this section, we consider a triangular array $\{Y_{is}, X_{is}\}_{i=1}^n$ from the s-th group. In order to keep the notation simple, the sample will be denoted by $\{X_i, Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$. In addition to the notation introduced in the main part of the manuscript, we will make use of the following notation throughout the appendix. Denote the empirical measure of n samples $(Y_i, \mathbf{Z}_i)$ by $\mathbb{P}_n$. For a function $x \mapsto f(x)$ define $\mathbb{G}_n(f) := n^{1/2} \int f(x)(d\mathbb{P}_n(x) - dP(x))$ and $\|f\|_{L_p(P)} = (\int |f(x)|^p dP(x))^{1/p}$ for $0 < p < \infty$. For a class of functions $\mathcal{G}$, let $\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} := \sup_{f\in\mathcal{G}} |\mathbb{P}_n f - Pf|$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, the covering number $N(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, L_p)$ is the minimal number of balls of radius ϵ (under L_p-norm) that is needed to cover $\mathcal{G}$. The bracketing number $N_{[\,]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, L_p)$ is the minimal number of ϵ-brackets that is needed to cover $\mathcal{G}$. An ϵ-bracket refers to a pair of functions within an ϵ distance: $\|u - l\|_{L_p} < \epsilon$. Throughout the proofs, C, C_1, C_j etc. will denote constants which do not depend on n but may have different values in different lines. For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, define $\psi(Y_i, \mathbf{Z}_i; \mathbf{b}, \tau) := \mathbf{Z}_i(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i \le \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \mathbf{b}\} - \tau)$ and $\mu(\mathbf{b}, \tau) := \mathbb{E}\big[\psi(Y_i, \mathbf{Z}_i; \mathbf{b}, \tau)\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbf{Z}_i\big\{F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}_i^\top \mathbf{b}|X) - \tau\big\}\big]$.

The aim of this section is to provide precise bounds on the remainder terms in the Bahadur representation of the estimator $\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ which is defined as

$$\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) := \arg\min_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau(Y_i - \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{Z}(X_i)), \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Theorem S.1.1. *Suppose Conditions (A1)-(A3) hold. Assume that additionally $m\xi_m^2 \log n = o(n)$. Then, for any $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\cdot)$ satisfying $g_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = o(\xi_m^{-1})$ and $c_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) = o(1)$, we have*

$$\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -n^{-1/2} J_m(\tau)^{-1} \mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau)) + r_{n,1}(\tau) + r_{n,2}(\tau) + r_{n,3}(\tau) + r_{n,4}(\tau). \quad \text{(S.1.1)}$$

The remainder terms $r_{n,j}$'s can be bounded as follows:

$$\sup_\tau \|r_{n,1}(\tau)\| \le \frac{1}{\inf_\tau \lambda_{min}(J_m(\tau))} \frac{m\xi_m}{n} \quad a.s. \quad \text{(S.1.2)}$$

Moreover, we have for any $\kappa_n \ll n/\xi_m^2$, all sufficiently large n, and a constant C independent of n

$$P\Big(\sup_\tau \|r_{n,j}(\tau)\| \le C\Re_j(\kappa_n)\Big) \ge 1 - 2e^{-\kappa_n}, \quad j = 2, 3, 4, \quad \text{(S.1.3)}$$

where

$$\Re_2(\kappa_n) := \xi_m\Big(\Big(\frac{m}{n}\log n\Big)^{1/2} + n^{-1/2}\kappa_n^{1/2} + g_n\Big)^2, \tag{S.1.4}$$

$$\Re_3(\kappa_n) := \Big(\Big(\frac{m\log n}{n}\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{\kappa_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2} + g_n\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\Big(\frac{m\xi_m\log n}{n}\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2}\Big), \tag{S.1.5}$$

$$\Re_4(\kappa_n) := c_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\Big(\Big(\frac{m}{n}\log n\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{\kappa_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2}}\Big) + g_n. \tag{S.1.6}$$

Additionally,

$$\sup_\tau \|r_{n,3}(\tau)\| \le \frac{2\xi_m}{\inf_\tau \lambda_{min}(\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)))}, \quad a.s., \tag{S.1.7}$$

and for a constant C_1 that depends only on $\bar{f}, \lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top])$ only, it holds that for sufficiently large n,

$$\sup_\tau \|\mathbb{E}[r_{n,3}(\tau)]\| \le C_1\xi_m^2\Big(g_n^2 + \frac{m\log n}{n}\Big). \tag{S.1.8}$$

The statements in (S.1.2)-(S.1.6) are from Theorem 5.1 of Chao et al. (2016) and reproduced here for the sake of completeness. The bound in (S.1.8) is new and crucial for the ABR in Theorem A.1 in the main manuscript. See Section S.1.1 in the supplementary material for a proof.

The next result provides a refined version of the previous theorem for local basis functions that satisfy Condition (L).

Theorem S.1.2. *Suppose Conditions (A1)-(A3) and (L) hold. Assume that additionally $m\xi_m^2\log n = o(n)$. Assume that the set $\mathcal{I}$ consists of at most $L \ge 1$ consecutive integers. Then, for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ defined in (3.8) we have*

$$\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau) = -n^{-1/2}\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1}\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau),\tau)) + \sum_{k=1}^4 r_{n,k}^{(L)}(\tau).$$

where remainder terms $r_{n,j}$'s can be bounded as follows:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\sup_\tau |\mathbf{a}^\top r_{n,1}^{(L)}(\tau)| \lesssim \frac{\xi_m\log n}{n} \quad a.s. \tag{S.1.9}$$

Moreover, we have for any $\kappa_n \ll n/\xi_m^2$, all sufficiently large n, and a constant C independent of n

$$P\Big(\sup_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\sup_\tau |\mathbf{a}^\top r_{n,j}^{(L)}(\tau)| \le C\Re_j^{(L)}(\kappa_n)\Big) \ge 1 - n^2e^{-\kappa_n}, \quad j = 2,3,4, \tag{S.1.10}$$

where

$$\Re_2^{(L)}(\kappa_n) := C\sup_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(\frac{\xi_m(\log n + \kappa_n^{1/2})}{n^{1/2}} + c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big)^2, \tag{S.1.11}$$

$$\Re_3^{(L)}(\kappa_n) := C\Big(c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\frac{\kappa_n^{1/2}\vee\log n}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{\xi_m^{1/2}(\kappa_n^{1/2}\vee\log n)^{3/2}}{n^{3/4}}\Big), \tag{S.1.12}$$

$$\Re_4^{(L)}(\kappa_n) := \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{f'}c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\sup_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N), \tag{S.1.13}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) := \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1}\mathbf{Z}]$. *Additionally,*

$$\sup_{\tau}\sup_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}} |\mathbf{a}^\top r_{n,3}^{(L)}(\tau)| \leq \frac{2\xi_m}{\inf_\tau \lambda_{min}(\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)))} \quad a.s. \tag{S.1.14}$$

and for sufficiently large n *we have for a constant* C_1 *that depends on* $\bar{f}, \lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top])$ *only*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}}\sup_{\tau} |\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbb{E}[r_{n,3}^{(L)}(\tau)]| \leq C_1 \sup_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi_m^2(\log n)^2}{n}\Big). \tag{S.1.15}$$

Similarly to the setting in Theorem S.1.1, the statements in (S.1.9)-(S.1.13) are proved in Theorem 5.2 of Chao et al. (2016) and reproduced here for the sake of completeness. The bound in (S.1.8) is new and crucial for the ABR in Theorem A.4.

In both proofs, we will repeatedly use the following leave-one-out estimator

$$\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) := \arg\min_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{i\neq j} \rho_\tau(Y_i - \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{Z}(X_i)), \quad \tau\in\mathcal{T}, j = 1,...,n \tag{S.1.16}$$

S.1.1 Proof of Theorem S.1.1

Observe the representation

$$\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -n^{-1/2} J_m(\tau)^{-1}\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau),\tau)) + r_{n,1}(\tau) + r_{n,2}(\tau) + r_{n,3}(\tau) + r_{n,4}(\tau)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{n,1}(\tau) &:= \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1}\mathbb{P}_n\psi(\cdot;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau),\\
r_{n,2}(\tau) &:= -\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1}\Big(\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau),\tau) - \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))\Big),\\
r_{n,3}(\tau) &:= -n^{-1/2}\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1}\Big(\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)) - \mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau),\tau))\Big),\\
r_{n,4}(\tau) &:= -n^{-1/2}(J_m(\tau)^{-1} - \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau),\tau)) - \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1}\mu(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau),\tau).
\end{aligned}$$

The bounds in (S.1.2)-(S.1.6) follow similarly as in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in Chao et al. (2016). The bound in (S.1.7) follows from the definition of $r_{n,3}$. It remains to prove (S.1.8). Note that the expectation of $r_{n,3}(\tau)$ is not zero in general. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
&r_{n,3}(\tau)\\
&= -\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1}\Big[-n^{-1/2}\mathbb{G}_n\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau),\tau) + n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\Big(\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau) - \mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)\Big)\\
&\quad - n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\Big(\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau) - \psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau) - \mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau) + \mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)\Big)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)$ in (S.1.16), the expectation of the first line in the above representation is zero. To bound the expectation of the second line, observe that for

$$\delta_n := \widetilde{C}\xi_m\Big(g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) + \frac{m\log n}{n}\Big)$$

with $\widetilde{C}$ sufficiently large we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\Big\|\mathbb{E}\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)\Big]\Big\|\\
=&\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|=1}\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbf{a}^\top\mathbf{Z}_j\big(\mathbf{1}\{Y_j\le\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\}-\mathbf{1}\{Y_j\le\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)\}\big)\Big]\Big|\\
\le&\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|=1}n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\Big[|\mathbf{a}^\top\mathbf{Z}_j|\mathbf{1}\big\{|Y_j-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)|\le\xi_m\delta_n\big\}\mathbf{1}\big\{\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|\le\xi_m\delta_n\big\}\Big]\\
&+\xi_m\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}P\Big(\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|>\xi_m\delta_n\Big)\\
\le&\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|=1}n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\Big[|\mathbf{a}^\top\mathbf{Z}_j|\big|F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)+\xi_m\delta_n|X_j)-F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\xi_m\delta_n|X_j)\big|\Big]\\
&+\xi_m P\Big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|>\xi_m\delta_n\Big)\\
\le&\,2\xi_m\delta_n\bar{f}\sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|=1}n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\big[|\mathbf{a}^\top\mathbf{Z}_j|\big]+\xi_m P\Big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|>\xi_m\delta_n\Big)\\
\le&\,2\xi_m\delta_n\bar{f}\lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top])^{1/2}+\xi_m P\Big(\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|>\xi_m\delta_n\Big)\\
\le&C_1\xi_m^2\Big(g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)+\frac{m\log n}{n}\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

for all sufficiently large n and a constant C_1 independent of τ, n. Here, the last line follows from Lemma S.1.3 and the definition of δ_n provided that $\widetilde{C}$ in the definition of δ_n is sufficiently large. Thus it remains to bound the expectation of $\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)$. A Taylor expansion shows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_\tau\|\mu(\mathbf{b}_1,\tau)-\mu(\mathbf{b}_2,\tau)\|&\le\sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|=1}\mathbb{E}\big[|\mathbf{a}^\top\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{1}\big\{|Y-\mathbf{Z}^\top\mathbf{b}_1|\le|\mathbf{Z}^\top(\mathbf{b}_1-\mathbf{b}_2)|\big\}\big]\\
&\le 2\bar{f}\sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|=1}\mathbb{E}\big[|\mathbf{a}^\top\mathbf{Z}||\mathbf{Z}^\top(\mathbf{b}_1-\mathbf{b}_2)|\big]\\
&\le 2\bar{f}\lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top])\|\mathbf{b}_1-\mathbf{b}_2\|,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality follows by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. On the other hand $\|\mu(\mathbf{b}_1,\tau)-\mu(\mathbf{b}_j,\tau)\|\le 2\xi_m$. Thus we have for any $\delta_n>0$,

$$
\sup_{\tau,j}\Big\|\mathbb{E}\big[\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)\big]\Big\|\le 2\bar{f}\lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top])\delta_n+2\xi_m P\Big(\sup_{\tau,j}\|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)\|>\delta_n\Big).
$$

Choosing δ_n as above completes the proof. □

Lemma S.1.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem S.1.1 we have for any $\kappa_n\ll n/\xi_m^2$, all sufficiently large n, and a constant C independent of n we have for $\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}$ defined in* (S.1.16)

$$
P\Big(\max_{j=1,\ldots,n}\sup_\tau\|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)\|\ge C\Big(g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\xi_m+\frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n}+\frac{m\xi_m\log n}{n}\Big)\Big)\le 2ne^{-\kappa_n}.
$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.3
Let $\mathbb{P}_n^{(-j)}(f) := (n-1)^{-1}\sum_{i\neq j} f(X_i, Y_i)$, $\mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}(f) := \sqrt{n-1}(\mathbb{P}_n^{(-j)}(f) - \mathbb{E}f(X_1, Y_1))$. Similarly to the decomposition considered previously (S.1.1), we have

$$\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau) = -(n-1)^{-1/2} J_m(\tau)^{-1} \mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}(\psi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau)) + \sum_{k=1}^{4} r_{n,k}^{(-j)}(\tau) \tag{S.1.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{n,1}^{(-j)}(\tau) &:= \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1} \mathbb{P}_n^{(-j)} \psi(\cdot; \breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau), \tau), \\
r_{n,2}^{(-j)}(\tau) &:= -\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1} \Big(\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau), \tau) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau) - \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)) \Big), \\
r_{n,3}^{(-j)}(\tau) &:= -(n-1)^{-1/2} \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1} \Big(\mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}(\psi(\cdot; \breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau), \tau)) - \mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}(\psi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau)) \Big), \\
r_{n,4}^{(-j)}(\tau) &:= -(n-1)^{-1/2} (J_m(\tau)^{-1} - \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1}) \mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}(\psi(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau)) - \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))^{-1} \mu(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau), \tau).
\end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments as in the proof for $r_{n,2}$ in Theorem 5.1 in Chao et al. (2016) there exists C independent of n such that $P(\Omega_{1,n}^{(j)}(C)) \leq e^{-\kappa_n}, j = 1, ..., n$ where we defined the event

$$\Omega_{1,n}^{(j)}(C) := \Big\{ \sup_{\tau} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\| \geq C\Big(g_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) + \frac{\kappa_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2}} + \Big(\frac{m \log n}{n}\Big)^{1/2} \Big) \Big\}. \tag{S.1.18}$$

Combining (S.1.1) and (S.1.17) we find that, almost surely,

$$\sup_j \sup_{\tau} \Big\| \breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \sum_{k=1}^{4} \Big(r_{n,k}^{(-j)}(\tau) - r_{n,k}(\tau) \Big) \Big\| \lesssim \frac{\xi_m}{n}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 26 on page 66 in Belloni et al. (2016), arguments from linear optimization lead to the bound

$$\sup_j \sup_{\tau} \|r_{n,1}^{(-j)}(\tau) - r_{n,1}(\tau)\| \leq \frac{2}{\inf_\tau \lambda_{min}(\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)))} \frac{m\xi_m}{n-1} \quad a.s.$$

Direct calculations show that

$$\sup_j \sup_{\tau} \|r_{n,4}^{(-j)}(\tau) - r_{n,4}(\tau)\| \leq C_1 \frac{\xi_m}{n},$$

and from Lemma S.1.5 we obtain for a constant C independent of j, τ, n

$$\|r_{n,2}^{(-j)}(\tau) - r_{n,2}(\tau)\| \leq C\xi_m \Big(\|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\|^2 + \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\|^2 \Big).$$

The probability of the event

$$\Omega_{1,n}(C) := \Big\{ \sup_{\tau,j} \Big(\|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\|^2 + \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\|^2 \Big) \geq C\Big(g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) + \frac{\kappa_n}{n} + \frac{m \log n}{n} \Big) \Big\}$$

can be bounded by $(n+1)e^{-\kappa_n}$ if C is chosen suitably, this follows from the bound $P(\Omega_{1,n}^{(j)}(C)) \leq e^{-\kappa_n}$ in (S.1.18). Finally, define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_2(\delta) := \Big\{ (z, y) \mapsto \mathbf{a}^\top z (\mathbf{1}\{y \leq z^\top \mathbf{b}_1\} - \mathbf{1}\{y \leq z^\top \mathbf{b}_2\}) \mathbf{1}\{\|z\| \leq \xi_m\} \Big| \\
\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m, \|\mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2\| \leq \delta, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{S}^{m-1} \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S.1.19}$$

Letting $\delta_n := \sup_j \sup_\tau \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)^{(-j)} - \breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)\|$, we have

$$\sup_j \sup_\tau \|r_{n,3}^{(-j)}(\tau) - r_{n,3}(\tau)\| \leq C_3\Big(\frac{\xi_m}{n} + \|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(\delta_n)}\Big).$$

Summarizing the bounds obtained so far we find for a constant C_4 independent of n

$$\delta_n \leq C_4\Big(\frac{m\xi_m}{n} + \|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(\delta_n)} + \sup_{\tau,j} \xi_m\big(\|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\|^2 + \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\|^2\big)\Big).$$

Consider the event

$$\Omega_{2,n}(C) := \Big\{ \sup_{0\leq t\leq 1} \frac{\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(t)}}{\chi_n(t,\kappa_n)} \geq C\Big\},$$

where

$$\chi_n(t,\kappa_n) = \xi_m^{1/2} t^{1/2}\Big(\frac{m}{n}\log(\xi_m \vee n)\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{m\xi_m}{n}\log(\xi_m \vee n) + \left(\frac{\xi_m t\kappa_n}{n}\right)^{1/2} + \frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n}$$

defined as (S.1.22) in Lemma S.1.4. It follows from (S.1.21) that $P(\Omega_{2,n}(C)) \leq e^{-\kappa_n}\log_2 n$ if we choose C suitably. Thus, δ_n satisfies the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_n &\leq C_8\xi_m\Big(g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) + \frac{\kappa_n}{n} + \frac{m\log n}{n}\Big) + C_8\chi_n(\delta_n,\kappa_n) \\
&\leq C_8\xi_m\Big(g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N) + \frac{\kappa_n}{n} + \frac{m\log n}{n}\Big) + C_8\frac{m\xi_m}{n}\log(\xi_m \vee n) + C_8\frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n} \\
&\quad + C_9\delta_n^{1/2}\Big(\frac{\xi_m m}{n}\log(\xi_m \vee n) + \frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2} \\
&:= a_n + \delta_n^{1/2} b_n
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2ne^{-\kappa_n}$ (note that $(n+1)e^{-\kappa_n} + \log_2 ne^{-\kappa_n} \leq 2ne^{-\kappa_n}$). A simple calculation shows that the inequality $0 \leq \delta_n \leq a_n + b_n\delta_n^{1/2}$ implies $0 \leq \delta_n \leq 4\max(a_n, b_n^2)$. Straightforward calculations show that under the assumption of the theorem we have

$$a_n + b_n^2 \lesssim g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\xi_m + \frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n} + \frac{m\xi_m\log n}{n}$$

provided that $\kappa_n \to \infty$. Thus we have for some constant C independent of n

$$P\Big(\delta_n \geq C\Big(g_n^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\xi_m + \frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n} + \frac{m\xi_m\log n}{n}\Big)\Big) \leq 2ne^{-\kappa_n}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma S.1.4. *Consider the class of functions $\mathcal{G}_2(\delta_n)$ defined in* (S.1.19)*. Under assumptions (A1)-(A3) and $\xi_m\delta_n \gg n^{-1}, \xi_m = O(n^b)$ for some $b < \infty$, we have for some constant C independent of n, sufficiently large n and arbitrary $\kappa_n > 0$,*

$$P\Big(\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(\delta_n)} \geq C\chi_n(\delta_n,\kappa_n)\Big) \leq e^{-\kappa_n} \tag{S.1.20}$$

and for $\kappa_n \geq 1$

$$P\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq 1} \frac{\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(t)}}{\chi_n(t,\kappa_n)} \geq 2C\Big) \leq e^{-\kappa_n}\log_2 n \tag{S.1.21}$$

where

$$\chi_n(t,\kappa_n) := \Big(\frac{m\xi_m}{n}\log(\xi_m \vee n)t\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{m\xi_m}{n}\log(\xi_m \vee n) + \Big(\frac{\xi_m\kappa_n t}{n}\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{\xi_m\kappa_n}{n}. \tag{S.1.22}$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.4. For a proof of (S.1.20) see Lemma S.1.3 in the supplementary material of Chao et al. (2016). For a proof of (S.1.21), observe that for $\kappa_n \geq 1$ we have $\chi_n(t/2, \kappa_n) \geq \chi_n(t, \kappa_n)/2, \chi_n(0, \kappa_n) \geq \chi_n(n^{-1}, \kappa_n)/2$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\leq t\leq 1} \frac{\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(t)}}{\chi_n(t,\kappa_n)} &\leq \Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq n^{-1}} \frac{\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(t)}}{\chi_n(t,\kappa_n)}\Big) \vee \Big(\max_{k:n^{-1}\leq 2^{-k}\leq 1} \sup_{2^{-k-1}\leq t\leq 2^{-k}} \frac{\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(t)}}{\chi_n(t,\kappa_n)}\Big) \\ &\leq \Big(\max_{k:n^{-1}\leq 2^{-k}\leq 1} \frac{2\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(2^{-k})}}{\chi_n(2^{-k},\kappa_n)}\Big) \vee \Big(\frac{2\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(n^{-1})}}{\chi_n(n^{-1},\kappa_n)}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

Now the set $\{k : n^{-1} \leq 2^{-k} \leq 1\}$ contains not more than $\log_2 n$ elements, and (S.1.21) thus follows from (S.1.20). □

Lemma S.1.5. *Under assumptions (A1)-(A3) we have*

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \sup_{\|\mathbf{b}-\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\|\leq\omega} \|\mu(\mathbf{b},\tau) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau),\tau) - \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))(\mathbf{b}-\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau))\| \;\leq\; \lambda^2_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top])\overline{f'}\omega^2\xi_m,$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.5 see the proof of Lemma S.1.1 in the supplementary material of Chao et al. (2016). □

Lemma S.1.6. *Let assumptions (A1)-(A3) hold. Then, for any $t > 1$*

$$\Big\{\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)\| \leq \frac{2t(s_{n,1} + g_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N))}{\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \lambda_{min}(\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)))}\Big\} \supseteq \Big\{(s_{n,1}+g_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)) < \frac{\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \lambda^2_{min}(\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N(\tau)))}{4t\xi_m\overline{f'}\lambda^2_{\max}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top])}\Big\}.$$

where $s_{n,1} := \|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_1}$ and

$$\mathcal{G}_1 := \Big\{(z,y) \mapsto \mathbf{a}^\top z(\mathbf{1}\{y \leq z^\top\mathbf{b}\} - \tau)\mathbf{1}\{\|z\| \leq \xi_m\}\Big|\tau \in \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{S}^m\Big\}$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.6. See the proof of Lemma S.1.2 in the supplementary material of Chao et al. (2016). □

S.1.2 Proof of Theorem S.1.2

We begin by introducing some notation and useful preliminary results which will be used throughout this section. For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and a set $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, ..., m\}$ let $\mathbf{v}^{(\mathcal{I})} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denote the vector that has entries v_i for $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and zero otherwise. Define

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{a}}(D) := \big\{i \in \{1, ..., m\} : |i - k_{\mathbf{a}}| \leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_0 + D\big\}. \tag{S.1.23}$$

Under (A1)-(A3) and (L) we obtain by similar arguments as in Lemma A.1 in Chao et al. (2016)

$$\|\mathbf{a}^\top\widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)) - (\mathbf{a}^\top\widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)))^{(\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{a}}(D))}\| \leq C\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty\|\mathbf{a}\|_0\lambda^D \tag{S.1.24}$$

for constants $\lambda \in (0, 1), C > 0$ independent of n, τ.

In the sequel, we will make use of the following decomposition which holds for any $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\widetilde{J}_m(\mathbf{b})$ is invertible

$$\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \mathbf{b} = -n^{-1/2}\widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{b})\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\mathbf{b},\tau)) + \widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{b})\sum_{k=1}^4 R_{n,k}(\tau,\mathbf{b}) \tag{S.1.25}$$

where

$$R_{n,1}(\tau,\mathbf{b}) := \mathbb{P}_n\psi(\cdot;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau), \tag{S.1.26}$$

$$R_{n,2}(\tau,\mathbf{b}) := -\Big(\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)-\mu(\mathbf{b},\tau)-\widetilde{J}_m(\mathbf{b})(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{b})\Big), \tag{S.1.27}$$

$$R_{n,3}(\tau,\mathbf{b}) := -n^{-1/2}\Big(\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau))-\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\mathbf{b},\tau))\Big), \tag{S.1.28}$$

$$R_{n,4}(\tau,\mathbf{b}) := -\mu(\mathbf{b},\tau). \tag{S.1.29}$$

Let $r^{(L)}_{n,k}(\tau) := \widetilde{J}_m^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))R_{n,k}(\tau,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)), k = 1,...,4$. The bounds in (S.1.9)-(S.1.13) follow similarly to the bounds (5.6)-(5.9) in Theorem 5.2 in Chao et al. (2016). The bound in (S.1.14) follows from the definition of $r_{n,3}$. Thus it remains to establish (S.1.15). Write

$$\begin{aligned}R_{n,3}(\tau,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)) = -\Big[&-n^{-1/2}\mathbb{G}_n\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau),\tau)+n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\Big(\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)\Big)\\&-n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\Big(\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)-\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)+\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)\Big)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\widetilde{\delta}_n := \widetilde{C}\Big(c_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)^4+\frac{\xi_m^2(\log n)^2}{n}\Big).$$

and observe that for any $\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}$, $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|(\mathbf{a}^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbb{E}\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\psi(Y_j,\mathbf{Z}_j;\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)\Big]\Big|\\
=&\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n(\mathbf{a}^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_j(\mathbf{1}\{Y_i\le\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\}-\mathbf{1}\{Y_i\le\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)\})\Big]\Big|\\
\lesssim\ & n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\mathbb{E}\Big[|(\mathbf{a}^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_j|\mathbf{1}\Big\{|Y_j-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)|\le\widetilde{\delta}_n\Big\}\mathbf{1}\Big\{\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|\le\widetilde{\delta}_n\Big\}\Big]\\
&+\xi_mP\Big(\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|>\widetilde{\delta}_n\Big)\\
\le\ & n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\mathbb{E}\Big[|(\mathbf{a}^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_j|\Big(F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)+\widetilde{\delta}_n|X_j)-F_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\widetilde{\delta}_n|X_j)\Big)\Big]\\
&+\xi_mP\Big(\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|>\widetilde{\delta}_n\Big)\\
\le\ & 2\widetilde{\delta}_n\bar{f}n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n\mathbb{E}\Big[|(\mathbf{a}^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_j|\Big]+\xi_mP\Big(\sup_j\big|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\big|>\widetilde{\delta}_n\Big)\\
\le& C_1\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big(c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)+\frac{\xi_m^2(\log n)^2}{n}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large n and a constant C_1 independent of $\tau,n,\mathbf{a}$. Here, the last line follows from Lemma S.1.7 with $\widetilde{C}$ in the definition of $\widetilde{\delta}_n$ chosen sufficiently large. Thus it remains to bound

$(\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbb{E}[\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)]$. A Taylor expansion shows that for $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2\in\mathbb{R}^m$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_\tau |(\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mu(\mathbf{b}_1,\tau)-\mu(\mathbf{b}_2,\tau)|\\
&\le \mathbb{E}\Big[|(\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_j|\mathbf{1}\Big\{|Y_j-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\mathbf{b}_1|\le|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top(\mathbf{b}_1-\mathbf{b}_2)|\Big\}\Big]\\
&\le 2\bar{f}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}}|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top(\mathbf{b}_1-\mathbf{b}_2)|.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand $\|\mu(\mathbf{b}_1,\tau)-\mu(\mathbf{b}_2,\tau)\|\le 2\xi_m$. Thus we have for any $\widetilde{\delta}_n>0,\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{m-1}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\tau,j}\Big\|(\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\mathbb{E}[\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau),\tau)-\mu(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau),\tau)]\Big\|\\
&\qquad\lesssim \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{a},\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\widetilde{\delta}_n+\xi_m P\Big(\sup_{\tau,j}\|\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}_j^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)\|>\widetilde{\delta}_n\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\widetilde{\delta}_n$ as above completes the proof. □

Lemma S.1.7. *Under the assumptions of Theorem S.1.2 we have for any $\kappa_n\ll n/\xi_m^2$, all sufficiently large n, and a constant C independent of n*

$$P\Big(\sup_{j,\tau,x}\|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)\|\ge C\Big(c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)+\frac{\xi_m^2(\kappa_n+(\log n)^2)}{n}\Big)\Big)\le 3m(n+1)e^{-\kappa_n}.$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.7

First we define some notations used exclusively in this proof:

$$\mathcal{I}(x):=\{i\in\{1,...,m\}:|i-k_{\mathbf{Z}(x)}|\le r+D\log n\},\tag{S.1.30}$$

$$\mathcal{I}'(x):=\{i\in\{1,...,m\}:\exists\, j\in\mathcal{I}(x)\text{ such that }|i-j|\le r\},\tag{S.1.31}$$

where r is defined in (L), and we suppress the dependence of $\mathcal{I}(x)$ and $\mathcal{I}'(x)$ on D for the sake of a simpler notation.

Let $\mathbb{P}_n^{(-j)}f:=(n-1)^{-1}\sum_{i\ne j}f(X_i,Y_i)$, $\mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}f:=\sqrt{n-1}(\mathbb{P}_n^{(-j)}f-\mathbb{E}f(X_1,Y_1))$. We have

$$\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))=-(n-1)^{-1/2}(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})^{(\mathcal{I}(x))}\mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau),\tau))+\sum_{k=1}^5 r_{n,k}^{(-j)}(\tau,x)\tag{S.1.32}$$

where $r_{n,k}^{(-j)}(\tau,x):=(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})^{(\mathcal{I}(x))}R_{n,k}^{(-j)}(\tau,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)),k=1,...,4$, $R_{n,k}^{(-j)}$ is defined exactly as $R_{n,k}$ in (S.1.26)-(S.1.29) with $n,\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}},\mathbb{P}_n,\mathbb{G}_n$ replaced by $n-1,\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)},\mathbb{P}_n^{(-j)},\mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}$, respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{n,5}^{(-j)}(\tau,x):=&-\Big[(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})^{(\mathcal{I}(x))}-(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\Big]\\
&\times-\Big[-(n-1)^{-1/2}\mathbb{G}_n^{(-j)}(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau),\tau))+\sum_{k=1}^4 R_{n,k}^{(-j)}(\tau,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))\Big]\\
=&\Big[(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})^{(\mathcal{I}(x))}-(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\Big](\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last expression follows from (S.1.25).

Similarly we have

$$\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))=-n^{-1/2}(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})^{(\mathcal{I}(x))}\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau),\tau))+\sum_{k=1}^{5}r_{n,k}(\tau)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}r_{n,5}(\tau,x):=&-\Big[(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})^{(\mathcal{I}(x))}-(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\Big]\\&\times-\Big[-n^{-1/2}\mathbb{G}_n(\psi(\cdot;\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau),\tau))+\sum_{k=1}^{4}R_{n,k}(\tau,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))\Big].\\=&\Big[(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})^{(\mathcal{I}(x))}-(\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1})\Big](\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)),\end{aligned}$$

where the last expression follows from (S.1.25).

We obtain the representation

$$\sup_{j,\tau,x}\Big|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-(r_{n,5}^{(-j)}(\tau,x)-r_{n,5}(\tau,x))-\sum_{k=1}^{3}\Big(r_{n,k}^{(-j)}(\tau,x)-r_{n,k}(\tau,x)\Big)\Big|\lesssim\frac{\xi_m^2}{n}\quad a.s.$$

Observe that $r_{n,4}^{(-j)}(\tau)-r_{n,4}(\tau)=0$ for all τ because $r_{n,4}$ does not depend on $\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)$ or $\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)$.

The results in Lemma S.1.11 show that

$$\sup_{j,\tau,x}\|r_{n,1}^{(-j)}(\tau,x)-r_{n,1}(\tau,x)\|\lesssim\frac{\xi_m^2\log n}{n}\quad a.s.$$

From Lemma S.1.10 and condition (L) we obtain for a constant C independent of j,τ,n,x

$$\|r_{n,2}^{(-j)}(\tau)-r_{n,2}(\tau)\|\le C\Big(|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|^2+|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|^2\Big).$$

Let $w_n:=\Big(c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)+\frac{\xi_m^2(\log n)^2+\xi_m^2\kappa_n}{n}\Big)$ and define the event

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_{1,n}(C):=\Big\{\sup_{\tau,j,x}\Big(|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau)-\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))|^2+|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)-\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))|^2\Big)\ge Cw_n\Big\}.$$

By an application of Lemma S.1.8, $P(\widetilde{\Omega}_{1,n}(C))$ can be bounded by $m(n+1)e^{-\kappa_n}$ if C is chosen suitably.

Next, let $\widetilde{\delta}_n:=\sup_{j,\tau,x}\|\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)^{(-j)}-\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau)\|$. We obtain for the class of functions $\mathcal{G}_2$ defined in (S.1.34) and using (L)

$$\sup_{j,\tau,x}|r_{n,3}^{(-j)}(\tau,x)-r_{n,3}(\tau,x)|\le C_3\Big(\frac{\xi_m^2}{n}+\xi_m\sup_x\|\mathbb{P}_n-P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(\widetilde{\delta}_n,\mathcal{I}(x),\mathcal{I}'(x))}\Big).$$

Consider the event [here $\widetilde{\chi}_n(t,\mathcal{I}_1,\mathcal{I}_j,\kappa_n)$ is defined as (S.1.38) in Lemma S.1.9]

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_{2,n}(C):=\Big\{\sup_x\sup_{0\le t\le1}\frac{\|\mathbb{P}_n-P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(t,\mathcal{I}(x),\mathcal{I}'(x))}}{\widetilde{\chi}_n(t,\mathcal{I}(x),\mathcal{I}'(x),\kappa_n)}\ge C\Big\}.$$

Since for $x\in\mathcal{X}$ the pair of sets $(\mathcal{I}(x),\mathcal{I}'(x))$ takes at most m distinct values, it follows from (S.1.37) that $P(\widetilde{\Omega}_{2,n}(C))\le me^{-\kappa_n}\log_2 n$ if we choose C suitably.

Finally, apply (S.1.24) to find that

$$\sup_{j,\tau,x} |r_{n,5}(\tau,x)| + |r_{n,5}^{(-j)}(\tau,x)| \lesssim \xi_m \lambda^{D\log n}\Big(\|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\| + \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\|\Big),$$

almost surely. Applying Theorem S.1.1 with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N$ allows to bound the probability of the event $\Omega_{3,n}(C) := \{\|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\| + \|\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(-j)}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)\| > C\}$ by $e^{-\kappa_n}$, and by choosing D sufficiently large it follows that $\sup_{j,\tau,x} |r_{n,5}(\tau,x)| + |r_{n,5}^{(-j)}(\tau,x)| \le n^{-1}$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-\kappa_n}$.

Summarizing the bounds obtained so far, there is a constant C_j independent of n such that $P(\widetilde{\Omega}_{1,n}(C_2) \cap \widetilde{\Omega}_{2,n}(C_2) \cap \Omega_{3,n}(C_2)) \le m(n+1)e^{-\kappa_n} + m\log_2 n e^{-\kappa_n} + e^{-\kappa_n} \le 3m(n+1)e^{-\kappa_n}$. On $\widetilde{\Omega}_{1,n}(C_2) \cap \widetilde{\Omega}_{2,n}(C_2) \cap \Omega_{3,n}(C_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_n &\le C_2\Big(c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi_m^2\kappa_n}{n} + \frac{\xi_m^2(\log n)^2}{n}\Big) + C_2 \sup_x \xi_m \chi_n(\delta_n, \mathcal{I}(x), \mathcal{I}'(x), \kappa_n) \\
&\le C_2\Big(c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi_m^2\kappa_n}{n} + \frac{\xi_m^2(\log n)^2}{n}\Big) + C_2\Big(\frac{\xi_m^2\log^2(\xi_m \vee n)}{n} + \frac{\xi_m^2\kappa_n}{n}\Big) \\
&\quad + C_2\delta_n^{1/2}\Big(\frac{\xi_m^2\log^2(\xi_m \vee n)}{n} + \frac{\xi_m^2\kappa_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2} \\
&:= a_n + \delta_n^{1/2} b_n.
\end{aligned}$$

A simple calculation shows that the inequality $0 \le \delta_n \le a_n + b_n\delta_n^{1/2}$ implies $0 \le \delta_n \le 4\max(a_n, b_n^2)$. Straightforward calculations show that under the assumption of the theorem we have

$$a_n + b_n^2 \lesssim c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi_m^2\log^2(\xi_m \vee n)}{n} + \frac{\xi_m^2\kappa_n}{n}.$$

Thus we have for some constant C_3 independent of n

$$P\Big(\delta_n \ge C_3\Big(c_m^4(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N) + \frac{\xi_m^2\log^2(\xi_m \vee n)}{n} + \frac{\xi_m^2\kappa_n}{n}\Big)\Big) \le 3m(n+1)e^{-\kappa_n}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma S.1.8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem S.1.2 we have for sufficiently large n and any $\kappa_n \ll n/\xi_m^2$*

$$P\Big(\sup_{\tau,x} |\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top(\breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))| \ge C\Big(\frac{\xi_m\log n + \xi_m\kappa_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2}} + c_m^2(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N)\Big)\Big) \le (m+1)e^{-\kappa_n}.$$

where the constant C does not depend on n.

Proof of Lemma S.1.8. See the proof for Lemma S.1.4 in the supplementary material of Chao et al. (2016). □

Lemma S.1.9. *Let $\mathcal{Z} := \{\mathbf{Z}(x)|x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ where $\mathcal{X}$ is the support of X. For arbitrary index sets $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}' \subset \{1, ..., m\}$, define the classes of functions*

$$\mathcal{G}_1(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}') := \Big\{(z, y) \mapsto \mathbf{a}^\top z^{(\mathcal{I})}(\mathbf{1}\{y \le z^\top \mathbf{b}^{(\mathcal{I}')}\} - \tau)\mathbf{1}\{\|z\| \le \xi_m\}\Big|\tau \in \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{S}^{m-1}\Big\}, \tag{S.1.33}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2(\delta, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}') := \Big\{(z, y) \mapsto \mathbf{a}^\top z^{(\mathcal{I})}(\mathbf{1}\{y \le z^\top \mathbf{b}_1^{(\mathcal{I}')}\} - \mathbf{1}\{y \le z^\top \mathbf{b}_j^{(\mathcal{I}')}\})\mathbf{1}\{z \in \mathcal{Z}\}\Big| \\ \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_j \in \mathbb{R}^m, \sup_{v \in \mathcal{Z}} \|v^\top \mathbf{b}_1 - v^\top \mathbf{b}_j\| \le \delta, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{S}^{m-1}\Big\}. \tag{S.1.34}$$

Under assumptions (A1)-(A3) we have

$$P\Big(\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_1} \ge C\Big[\Big(\frac{\max(|\mathcal{I}|, |\mathcal{I}'|)}{n} \log \xi_m\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{\max(|\mathcal{I}|, |\mathcal{I}'|)\xi_m}{n} \log \xi_m + \frac{\kappa_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{\xi_m \kappa_n}{n}\Big]\Big) \le e^{-\kappa_n} \tag{S.1.35}$$

and for $\xi_m \delta_n \gg n^{-1}$ we have for sufficiently large n and arbitrary $\kappa_n > 0$

$$P\Big(\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(\delta, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}')} \ge C\widetilde{\chi}_n(\delta_n, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}', \kappa_n)\Big) \le e^{-\kappa_n} \tag{S.1.36}$$

and for $\kappa_n \ge 1$

$$P\Big(\sup_{0 \le t \le 1} \frac{\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}_2(t, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}')}}{\widetilde{\chi}_n(t, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}', \kappa_n)} \ge 2C\Big) \le e^{-\kappa_n} \log_2 n \tag{S.1.37}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\chi}_n(t, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}', \kappa_n) \;:=\; & t^{1/2}\Big(\frac{\max(|\mathcal{I}|, |\mathcal{I}'|)}{n} \log(\xi_m \vee n)\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{\max(|\mathcal{I}|, |\mathcal{I}'|)\xi_m}{n} \log(\xi_m \vee n) \\ & + \Big(\frac{t\kappa_n}{n}\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{\xi_m \kappa_n}{n}.\end{aligned} \tag{S.1.38}$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.9. See the proof for Lemma S.1.5 in the supplementary material of Chao et al. (2016). The proof of (S.1.37) is similar to the proof for (S.1.21). □

Lemma S.1.10. *Under assumptions (A1)-(A3) we have for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m$*

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1}\mu(\mathbf{b}, \tau) - \mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1}\mu(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau), \tau) - \mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{b} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))\Big| \\ \le\; & \overline{f'} \sup_x |\mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Z}(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau)|^2 \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{a}^\top \widetilde{J}_m(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_N(\tau))^{-1}\mathbf{Z}|].\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.10 See the proof for Lemma S.1.6 in the supplementary material of Chao et al. (2016). □

Lemma S.1.11. *Under assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (L) we have for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ having zero entries everywhere except at L consecutive positions:*

$$|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbb{P}_n \psi(\cdot; \breve{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tau), \tau)| \le \frac{(L + 2r)\|\mathbf{a}\|\xi_m}{n}.$$

Proof of Lemma S.1.11. See the proof for Lemma S.1.7 in the Chao et al. (2016). □

S.2. Proof of (C.19)-(C.20) and (C.22)-(C.23)

Let $U_i := F_{a,b}(Y_i)$. By strict monotonicity of $F_{a,b}$ on its support we have $U_i \sim U[0,1]$. Moreover $Y^j_{(k)} = Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(k)})$ where $U^j_{(k)}$ denotes the kth order statistic of the sample $\{U_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{A}_j}$ if $\mathcal{A}_j$ is non-empty and $U^j_{(k)} := 0$ if $\mathcal{A}_j$ is empty. By independence of $\{Y_1,...,Y_n\}$ and $\{X_1,...,X_n\}$ we have conditionally on $\{X_1,...,X_n\}$,

$$U^j_{(k)} \sim \mathbf{1}\{n_j > 0\} Beta(k, n_j + 1 - k). \tag{S.2.1}$$

Throughout this section we use the notation introduced in section C.3.2.

S.2.1 Proof of (C.19) and (C.22) (bias)

Proof of (C.19): note that

$$m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau) = Y^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}\mathbf{1}\{n_j>0\} = Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})\mathbf{1}\{n_j>0\} = Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})$$

where $n_j \sim Bin(n, 1/m)$ and the last equality uses the definition of $U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}$ and the fact that $Q_{a,b}(0) = 0$. Now we distinguish two cases.

If $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m)\big|\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)} - \tau]\big| > 0$, using the definition of $Q_{a,b}$:

$$\big|\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau)]\big| = \big|a(\mathbb{E}[(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})^2 - \tau^2]) + b(\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)} - \tau])\big|, \tag{S.2.2}$$

so (C.19) holds for any $b > 0$ and $a = 0$.

If $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m)\big|\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)} - \tau]\big| = 0$ apply (S.2.1) and (S.2.13) in Lemma S.2.1 to obtain

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})] - Q_{a,b}(\tau)\Big| \geq \frac{a\tau(1-\tau)}{200} > 0 \tag{S.2.3}$$

since $\mathcal{T} = [\tau_L, \tau_U]$ with $0 < \tau_L < \tau_U < 1$. Thus (C.19) holds for any $b > 0$ and $0 < a < a_{max}$.

Proof of (C.20): note that $Q_{a,b}$ is a polynomial of degree 2 and

$$\Big\|\sum_{k=1}^K A_k(\cdot)Q_{a,b}(\tau_k) - Q_{a,b}(\cdot)\Big\|_\infty = \big\|\Pi_K Q_{a,b} - Q_{a,b}\big\|_\infty$$

where $\Pi_K f$ denotes the projection, with respect to the inner product $\langle f, g\rangle := \sum_k f(\tau_k)g(\tau_k)$, of a function f onto the space of functions spanned by $B_1,...,B_q$. Since $B_1,...,B_q$ are splines of degree $r_\tau \geq \eta_\tau \geq 2$, $Q_{a,b}$ lies in the space spanned by $B_1,...,B_q$ (see p.111 of Schumaker (1981)). In other words, $Q_{a,b} \in \Theta_G$ where Θ_G is defined in the beginning of Section C.4.4. Therefore, by similar arguments as in Section C.4.4

$$\big\|\Pi_K Q_{a,b} - Q_{a,b}\big\|_\infty \lesssim \inf_{p\in\Theta_G}\|p - Q_{a,b}\|_\infty = 0. \tag{S.2.4}$$

We have from (S.2.4),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[m^{1/2}\check{\beta}_j(\tau) - Q_{a,b}(\tau)] &= \sum_{k=1}^K A_k(\tau)\mathbb{E}[m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)] \\ &= \sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau)\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_k\rceil)}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)] + o(m/n),\end{aligned} \tag{S.2.5}$$

where the $o(m/n)$ is uniform in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. The first equality above is from (S.2.4), and the second follows from the fact that $\sup_\tau \left|\mathbb{E}[m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau) - Q_{a,b}(\tau)]\right| \leq 2(a+b)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau|>(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau)\mathbb{E}\big[m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)\big]\Big| \\ \leq 2(a+b)\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau|>(\log G)^2/G} |A_k(\tau)| \lesssim \gamma^{(\log G)^2/2} = o(m/n),\end{aligned} \tag{S.2.6}$$

where $0<\gamma<1$; in the second above inequality we apply the bound (S.2.33) in Lemma S.2.3.

Hence, by (S.2.5), it suffices to prove that for $b>0$ and any $a_{max}>0$, there exists $a \in [0, a_{max}]$ and a sequence τ_N such that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_k\rceil)}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)\big]\Big| > 0. \tag{S.2.7}$$

In the following, we will distinguish the cases $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m) < \infty$ and $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m) = \infty$.

First consider the case $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m) < \infty$. Invoke (S.2.17) in Lemma S.2.2 to see that there exist a sequence τ_N in $\mathcal{T}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_k\rceil)}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)\big]\Big| \\ \geq \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_N\rceil)}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_N)\big]\Big|\end{aligned}$$

If $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m)\big|\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_N\rceil)} - \tau_N]\big| \neq 0$, use (S.2.2), to see that the right-hand side in the equation above is non-zero for any $b>0$ and $a=0$.

If $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m)\big|\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_N\rceil)} - \tau_N]\big| = 0$ use (S.2.13) in Lemma S.2.1 to obtain

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_N\rceil)}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_N)\big]\Big| \geq \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{a\tau_N(1-\tau_N)}{200} > 0$$

where the last bound follows since $0<\tau_L\leq\tau_N\leq\tau_U<1$ for all N. Thus we have established (S.2.7) for the case $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m) > 0$.

Next consider the case $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m) = \infty$. By (S.2.18) in Lemma S.2.2 there exist a sequence $\tau_N \in \mathcal{T}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_k\rceil)}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)\big]\Big| \\ \geq \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m}\Big|a\frac{\tau_N(1-\tau_N)}{(n/m)+1} + (b+2a\tau_N)\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\Big(\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_k\rceil)}] - \tau_N\Big)\Big|.\end{aligned}$$

We distinguish two cases.

If $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m)\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\Big(\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_k\rceil)}] - \tau_N\Big)\Big| > 0$, (S.2.7) holds for τ_N with any $b>0$ and $a=0$.

If $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m)\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\Big(\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau_k\rceil)}]-\tau_N\Big)\Big|=0$, we can pick an arbitrary $0<a\le a_{max}$ since $\tau_N\in\mathcal{T}=[\tau_L,\tau_U]$ with $0<\tau_L<\tau_U<1$ and thus

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\left|a\frac{\tau_N(1-\tau_N)}{(n/m)+1}\right|\ge\frac{1}{2}\limsup_{N\to\infty}a\tau_N(1-\tau_N)\ge\frac{1}{2}a\min\big\{\tau_L(1-\tau_L),\tau_U(1-\tau_U)\big\}>0.$$

Thus, (S.2.7) holds when $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(n/m)=\infty$. Combining the two cases above completes the proof of (S.2.7). □

S.2.2 Proof of (C.20) and (C.23)

We begin by proving a slightly stronger version of (C.20) for any j:

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau))\lesssim 1/n. \tag{S.2.8}$$

Observe that, as discussed in te beginning of Section S.2.1, $m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)=Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}\big(m^{1/2}\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau)\big)&=\mathrm{Var}\big(Q_{a,b}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})\big)\\
&=\mathbb{E}\big[\big\{a\big((U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})^2-\mathbb{E}[(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})^2]\big)+b\big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}]\big)\big\}^2\big]\\
&=\mathbb{E}\big[\big\{a\big((U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})^2-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}]^2-\mathrm{Var}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})\big)+b\big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}]\big)\big\}^2\big]\\
&\le 9\big\{(4a^2+b^2)\mathrm{Var}\big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}\big)+a^2\mathrm{Var}\big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}\big)^2\big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is enough to show that

$$\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}}\mathrm{Var}\big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}\big)\lesssim m/n. \tag{S.2.9}$$

Distinguish two cases. If m/n is bounded away from zero, this follows since $|U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|\le 1$ and thus $\mathrm{Var}\big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}\big)$ is bounded by a constant independent of τ. We will thus without loss of generality assume that $m/n\to 0$. Observe the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)})&=\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}]\Big)^2\Big]\\
&=\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|n_j]\Big)^2\Big]+\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|n_j]-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}]\Big)^2\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

First observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|n_j]\Big)^2\Big]\\
&\quad=\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|n_j]\big)^2\mathbf{1}\Big\{\Big|n_j-\frac{n}{m}\Big|\le 6\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}\log\Big(\frac{n}{m}\Big)}\Big\}\Big]+O\big((n/m)^{-2}\big)\\
&\quad\le\max_{l:|l-(n/m)|\le 6\sqrt{(n/m)\log(n/m)}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(U^j_{(\lceil l\tau\rceil)}-\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil l\tau\rceil)}]\big)^2\Big]+O\big((n/m)^{-2}\big)\\
&\quad=\max_{l:|l-(n/m)|\le 6\sqrt{(n/m)\log(n/m)}}\mathrm{Var}\big(U_{(\lceil l\tau\rceil)}\big)+O\big((n/m)^{-2}\big),\\
&\quad\asymp m/n,
\end{aligned}\tag{S.2.10}$$

uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Here, the first equality follows since, $\left|\left(U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)} - \mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|n_j]\right)\right|^2 \leq 1$ a.s., $n_j \sim Bin(n, 1/m)$ and the following result which is a consequence of Bernstein's inequality

$$P\Big(\Big|n_j - \frac{n}{m}\Big| \geq C\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}\log\Big(\frac{n}{m}\Big)}\Big) \leq 2\Big(\frac{n}{m}\Big)^{-C/3} \quad \text{for all } C \geq 1 \tag{S.2.11}$$

The final inequality is from (S.2.1).

Next, observe that, almost surely,

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|n_j] - \tau\Big| \leq \frac{1}{n_j+1}$$

by (S.2.1). This implies $|\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}] - \tau| \leq \mathbb{E}[(1+n_j)^{-1}]$, and thus

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}|n_j] - \mathbb{E}[U^j_{(\lceil n_j\tau\rceil)}]\Big)^2\Big] \lesssim \mathbb{E}\big[(1+n_j)^{-2}\big] + (\mathbb{E}[(1+n_j)^{-1}])^2 = O((m/n)^2) \tag{S.2.12}$$

by an application of (S.2.11). Combining (S.2.10) and (S.2.12) finishes the proof of (S.2.9).

To prove (C.23), note that by Hölder's inequality and Lemma S.2.3

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|\check{\beta}_j(\tau) - \mathbb{E}[\check{\beta}_j(\tau)]|^2] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{k=1}^K A_k(\tau)\{\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k)]\}\Big)^2\Big] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{k=1}^K |A_k(\tau)|\Big)\Big(\sum_{k=1}^K |A_k(\tau)||\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k)]|^2\Big)\Big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{k=1,\ldots,K} \mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{\beta}_j(\tau_k)) \\
&\lesssim 1/n,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is an application of (S.2.8). □

S.2.3 Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma S.2.1. *Assume that $W_n \sim Bin(n, 1/m)$ and that $U_\tau|W_n = w \sim Beta(\lceil w\tau\rceil, w+1-\lceil w\tau\rceil)$ if $w > 0$ and $U_\tau = 0$ a.s. conditional on $W_n = 0$. Let $Q_{a,b}(x) := ax^2 + bx$. Then for any $a, b \geq 0$ and n, m such that $n \geq 2$, $n/m \geq 1$, we have for all $\tau \in (0,1)$ that*

$$\frac{n}{m}\big|\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U_\tau) - Q_{a,b}(\tau)]\big| \geq \frac{a\tau(1-\tau)}{200} - \frac{n}{m}b\big|\mathbb{E}[U_\tau - \tau]\big| - 2a\frac{n}{m}\big|\mathbb{E}[U_\tau - \tau]\big|. \tag{S.2.13}$$

Proof of Lemma S.2.1. For a proof of (S.2.13), note that

$$|(\mathbb{E}[U_\tau])^2 - \tau^2| \leq 2|\mathbb{E}[U_\tau] - \tau|.$$

Note also that

$$\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau) = \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau|W)] + \mathrm{Var}(\mathbb{E}[U_\tau|W]) \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau|W)].$$

Thus with an application of triangle inequality, for $a, b \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U_\tau) - Q_{a,b}(\tau)]\big| &= \big|a(\mathbb{E}[U_\tau^2 - \tau^2]) + b(\mathbb{E}[U_\tau - \tau])\big| \\
&\geq a\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau|W)] - b\big|\mathbb{E}[U_\tau - \tau]\big| - 2a\big|\mathbb{E}[U_\tau - \tau]\big|.
\end{aligned} \tag{S.2.14}$$

Next we will prove a lower bound on $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau|W)]$. The following tail bound on binomial probabilities follows from the Bernstein inequality

$$P\Big(W_n \geq (1+x)\frac{n}{m}\Big) \leq \exp\Big(-\frac{x^2}{2+x}\frac{n}{m}\Big) \quad \forall x \geq 0$$

In particular for $n/m \geq 1$ setting $C = x - 1$ yields for $C \geq 1$

$$P\Big(W_n \geq C\frac{n}{m}\Big) \leq \exp\Big(-\frac{(C-1)^2}{1+C}\Big) \tag{S.2.15}$$

Next note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau|W)] = \sum_{w=1}^{\infty} P(W_n = w)\frac{\lceil w\tau\rceil(w+1-\lceil w\tau\rceil)}{(w+1)^2(w+2)},$$

and moreover for any $w > 0$

$$\frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{4(w+2)} \leq \frac{\lceil w\tau\rceil(w+1-\lceil w\tau\rceil)}{(w+1)^2(w+2)} \leq \frac{1}{w+2}.$$

Thus from (S.2.15) we obtain for $n/m \geq 1$ by setting $C = 3$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau|W)] &\geq \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{4(3(n/m)+2)}\Big(P(W_n > 0) - e^{-1}\Big) \geq \frac{m}{n}\frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{20}\Big(\frac{1}{2} - e^{-1}\Big) \\ &\geq \frac{m}{n}\frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{200}. \end{aligned} \tag{S.2.16}$$

where we used the fact that for $n \geq 2, n/m \geq 1$ we have $P(W_n > 0) \geq 1/2$. The result follows by combining this with (S.2.14).

□

Lemma S.2.2 (Localization)**.** *Let all conditions in Lemma S.2.1 hold and assume that additionally $N \geq m$, $G \gg (N/m)^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$ and $S \gg (N/m)^{1/2}$. Recall the definitions of $A_k, Q_{a,b}$ given in Section C.3.2 and assume that $r_\tau \geq 2$.*

1. *If $\limsup_{N\to\infty} n/m < \infty$ there exists a sequence τ_N in $\mathcal{T}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U_{\tau_k}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)]\Big| \\ \geq \limsup_{N\to\infty}\,(n/m)\big|\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U_{\tau_N}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_N)]\big| \end{aligned} \tag{S.2.17}$$

2. *If $\limsup_{N\to\infty} n/m = \infty$ there exists a sequence τ_N in $\mathcal{T}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U_{\tau_k}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)]\Big| \\ &\geq \limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|a\frac{\tau_N(1-\tau_N)}{(n/m)+1} + (b+2a\tau_N)\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\leq(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\Big(\mathbb{E}[U_{\tau_k}] - \tau_N\Big)\Big| \end{aligned} \tag{S.2.18}$$

Proof of Lemma S.2.2. For a proof of (S.2.17), for arbitrary $w_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, observe that the sum

$$S_{w_0}(\tau) := \sum_{w=1}^{w_0} P(W_n = w)\big(a\mathbb{E}[U_\tau^2|W_n = w] + b\mathbb{E}[U_\tau|W_n = w]\big) \tag{S.2.19}$$

is a piecewise constant function of τ. This function is constant on intervals of the form $[l_1/w_1, l_2/w_2]$ for some positive integers $l_1, l_2, w_1, w_2 \le w_0$ satisfying $\tau_L \le l_1/w_1 < l_2/w_2 \le \tau_U$. Thus, the length of each interval where S_{w_0} is constant can be bounded from below as follows

$$\frac{l_1}{w_1} - \frac{l_2}{w_2} = \frac{l_1 w_2 - l_2 w_1}{w_1 w_2} \ge w_0^{-2}, \tag{S.2.20}$$

since $l_1 w_2 - l_2 w_1 \ge 1$ because both $l_1 w_2$ and $l_2 w_1$ are positive integers, and $w_1, w_2 \le w_0$. Let $w_N = \log G$. Then

$$a(\mathbb{E}[U_\tau^2 - \tau^2]) + b(\mathbb{E}[U_\tau - \tau]) = S_{w_N}(\tau) - P(W_n \le w_N)(b\tau + a\tau^2) + r_G(\tau) \tag{S.2.21}$$

where the remainder satisfies $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |r_G(\tau)| \le 2(a+b)P(W_n > w_N)$, and by (S.2.15)

$$P(W_n > w_N) = o(1), \quad \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |r_G(\tau)| = o(m/n) \tag{S.2.22}$$

since $w_N \to \infty$ and we are in the case n/m bounded. For each N, select τ_N as the midpoint of any open interval $\mathcal{J}_N \subset \mathcal{T}$ on which $S_{w_N}(\tau)$ is a constant. From the choice of τ_N and w_N, we have when N is sufficiently large,

$$S_{w_N}(\tau_k) = S_{w_N}(\tau_N) \text{ for all } k : |\tau_k - \tau_N| \le 1/(3w_N^2) \tag{S.2.23}$$

and in particular $S_{w_N}(\tau_k) = S_{w_N}(\tau_N)$ for $k : |\tau_k - \tau_N| \le (\log G)^2/G$ since $G \to \infty$. Hence, for each N, we get from (S.2.21) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U_{\tau_k}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)] \\
&= \sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\big[a(\mathbb{E}[U_{\tau_k}^2 - \tau_k^2]) + b(\mathbb{E}[U_{\tau_k} - \tau_k])\big] \\
&= \sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\Big\{S_{w_N}(\tau_k) + \Big(- P(W_n \le w_N)(b\tau_k + a\tau_k^2) + r_G(\tau_k)\Big)\Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S.2.24}$$

Note that by similar argument as (S.2.4) and (S.2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G} \Big\{A_k(\tau_N)(b\tau_k + a\tau_k^2)\Big\} - (b\tau_N + a\tau_N^2)\Big| \\
&\overset{\text{(S.2.6)}}{=} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^{K} \Big\{A_k(\tau_N)(b\tau_k + a\tau_k^2)\Big\} - (b\tau_N + a\tau_N^2)\Big| + o(m/n) \overset{\text{(S.2.4)}}{=} o(m/n),
\end{aligned} \tag{S.2.25}$$

and

$$\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N) r_G(\tau_k)\Big| \overset{\text{(S.2.6)}}{=} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k(\tau_N) r_G(\tau_k)\Big| + o(m/n) = o(m/n). \tag{S.2.26}$$

where the last identity follows from (S.2.21) and Lemma S.2.3. Hence, we obtain from (S.2.24) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\mathbb{E}[Q_{a,b}(U_{\tau_k})-Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)]\Big| \\
&\overset{\text{(S.2.25)}}{\underset{\text{(S.2.26)}}{=}} \limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G}\Big\{A_k(\tau_N)S_{w_N}(\tau_k)\Big\}-P(W_n\le w_N)(b\tau_N+a\tau_N^2)\Big| \\
&\overset{\text{(S.2.23)}}{=} \limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|S_{w_N}(\tau_N)\sum_{k:|\tau_k-\tau_N|\le(\log G)^2/G}\Big\{A_k(\tau_N)\Big\}-P(W_n\le w_N)(b\tau_N+a\tau_N^2)\Big| \\
&\overset{\text{(S.2.6)}}{=} \limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\Big|S_{w_N}(\tau_N)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\Big\{A_k(\tau_N)\Big\}-P(W_n\le w_N)(b\tau_N+a\tau_N^2)\Big| \\
&= \limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{n}{m}\big|S_{w_N}(\tau_N)-P(W_n\le w_N)(b\tau_N+a\tau_N^2)+r_G(\tau_N)\big|.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last line follows from Lemma S.2.3. Apply (S.2.21) to complete the proof of (S.2.17).

For a proof of (S.2.18), note that by the law of iterated expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U_\tau)-Q_{a,b}(\tau)\big]=a(\mathbb{E}[v_{2,n}(\tau)]+\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}^2(\tau)]-\tau^2)+b(\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau)]-\tau) \tag{S.2.27}$$

where

$$v_{1,n}(\tau):=\mathbb{E}[U_\tau|W_n]=\mathbf{1}\{W_n>0\}\frac{\lceil W_n\tau\rceil}{W_n+1};\ v_{2,n}(\tau):=\mathrm{Var}(U_\tau|W_n)=\mathbf{1}\{W_n>0\}\frac{\lceil W_n\tau\rceil(W_n+1-\lceil W_n\tau\rceil)}{(W_n+1)^2(W_n+2)}. \tag{S.2.28}$$

The following bound for binomial random variables can be obtained by Bernstein's inequality for $n/m\ge 1$:

$$P\Big(|W_n-n/m|\ge C\sqrt{(n/m)\log(n/m)}\Big)\le 2(n/m)^{-C/3}\quad\text{for all } C\ge 1$$

Using this bound, straightforward calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau)]&=\tau+O(m/n)\\
\mathbb{E}[v_{2,n}(\tau)]&=\frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{(n/m)+1}+o(m/n)\\
\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}^2(\tau)-\tau^2]&=2\tau\big(\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau)]-\tau\big)+o(m/n)
\end{aligned}$$

where all remainder terms are uniform in $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$. Here, the first equation is a consequence of the fact that $|v_{1,n}(\tau)-\tau|\le(1+W_n)^{-1}$ while the third equation follows since

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}^2(\tau)-\tau^2]-2\tau\big(\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau)]-\tau\big)=\mathbb{E}[(v_{1,n}(\tau)-\tau)^2].$$

Thus, from (S.2.27),

$$\mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U_\tau)-Q_{a,b}(\tau)\big]=a\frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{(n/m)+1}+(b+2a\tau)\big(\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau)]-\tau\big)+r_{1,N}(\tau) \tag{S.2.29}$$

where $r_{1,N}(\tau) = o((n/m)^{-1})$ uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Pick $\tau_N \equiv \tau$ for an arbitrary $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. From Lemma S.2.3 we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{k:|\tau_k - \tau_N| \le (\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N) r_{1,N}(\tau_k) \right| \le \sup_{k=1,...,K} |r_{1,N}(\tau_k)| \sum_{k=1}^{K} |A_k(\tau)| = o(m/n). \tag{S.2.30}$$

Hence, combine (S.2.30) and (S.2.29) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m} \left| \sum_{k:|\tau_k - \tau_N| \le (\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N) \mathbb{E}\big[Q_{a,b}(U_{\tau_k}) - Q_{a,b}(\tau_k)\big] \right| \\
&\overset{\text{(S.2.29)}}{\underset{\text{(S.2.30)}}{=}} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m} \left| \sum_{k:|\tau_k - \tau_N| \le (\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N) \Big\{ a \frac{\tau_k(1-\tau_k)}{(n/m)+1} + (b + 2a\tau_k)\big(\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau_k)] - \tau_k\big) \Big\} \right| \\
&\overset{\text{(S.2.6)}}{\underset{\text{(S.2.4)}}{=}} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{n}{m} \left| a \frac{\tau_N(1-\tau_N)}{(n/m)+1} + (b + 2a\tau_N) \sum_{k:|\tau_k - \tau_N| \le (\log G)^2/G} A_k(\tau_N)\big(\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau_k)] - \tau_N\big) \right|
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since for all k in the sum $|\tau_k - \tau_N| = O((\log G)^2/G) = o(1)$ and $|\mathbb{E}[v_{1,n}(\tau_k)]| = \tau_k + O(m/n)$ uniformly in τ_k. This completes the proof of (S.2.18). □

Lemma S.2.3. *Assume that $K \ge G$. Recall the definition of $A_k(\tau)$ in* (C.21)*. There exist constants $c, C > 0$ independent of K, G such that $\sup_{k,\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |A_k(\tau)| \le c, \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \sum_{k=1}^{K} |A_k(\tau)| \le C$. Moreover, for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k(\tau) = 1$.*

Proof of Lemma S.2.3.

We start with proving $\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k(\tau) = 1$. Observe that $\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k(\tau) = \Pi_K g_1$, where Π_K is defined in Section C.4.4 and $g_1(x) \equiv 1$. Since the degree of the piecewise polynomials in $\mathbf{B}$ is greater or equal to 2 and g_1 is an order 0 polynomial, similar arguments as used in the proof of (S.2.4) show that $\|\Pi_K g_1 - 1\|_\infty = 0$. This implies $\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k(\tau) = 1$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.

To obtain a bound for $\sup_{k,\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |A_k(\tau)|$, note that

$$\sup_{k,\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \big|A_k(\tau)\big| = \sup_k \|\Pi_K \bar{e}_k\|_\infty \le \|\Pi_K\|_\infty \sup_k \|\bar{e}_k\|_\infty,$$

where $\bar{e}_k(\cdot) : \mathcal{T} \to [0,1]$ is the function interpolating $\big\{(\tau_1, 0),..., (\tau_{k-1}, 0),(\tau_k, 1),(\tau_{k+1}, 0)...,(\tau_K, 0)\big\}$, so $\sup_k \|\bar{e}_k\|_\infty = 1$. In the first step in Section C.4.4 we have shown that $\|\Pi_K\|_\infty < C'$ for some constant $C' > 0$ independent of K. Hence, taking $c = \|\Pi_K\|_\infty$ finishes the first claim.

Next we show that $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \sum_{k=1}^{K} |A_k(\tau)| \le C$. For any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\tau_k \in \mathcal{T}_K$, define the index sets

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(\tau) &:= \big\{j \in \{1,...,q\} : B_j(\tau) \ne 0\big\}; \\
\mathcal{I}_k &:= \big\{j \in \{1,...,q\} : B_j(\tau_k) \ne 0\big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\mathcal{I}(\tau)| = |\mathcal{I}(\tau_k)| = r_\tau + 1$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and k, and the elements in both sets are consecutive positive integers by the connective support of B_j.

By Lemma 6.3 of Zhou et al. (1998) (note that their $\mathbf{N}$, n and $G_{k,n}$ are our $\mathbf{B}$, K and $K^{-1}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\mathbf{B}(\tau_k)^\top$, while their h is of order $1/G$ see page 1761, 1762 and 1765 of Zhou

et al. (1998)), there exist constants $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $c_1 > 0$ independent of K, G, τ such that the ij'th element of the matrix satisfies

$$\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\mathbf{B}(\tau_k)^\top\Big)^{-1}_{ij} \leq c_1 K^{-1} G \gamma^{|j-i|} \leq c_1 \gamma^{|j-i|} \tag{S.2.31}$$

where the second inequality follows from our assumption that $K \geq G$.

Recall that our B_j is defined as given in Definition 4.19 on page 124 of Schumaker (1981). Thus, by equation (4.31) in the same reference, $\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \max_{j\leq q} |B_j(\tau)|^2 \leq 1$, and by (S.2.31),

$$\big|A_k(\tau)\big| = \Big|\mathbf{B}(\tau)^\top \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\mathbf{B}(\tau_k)^\top\Big)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(\tau_k)\Big| \leq c_1 \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}(\tau), j'\in\mathcal{I}_k} \gamma^{|j-j'|} \tag{S.2.32}$$

$$\leq c_1 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \big(\big|(\mathcal{I}(\tau)+l)\cap\mathcal{I}_k\big| + \big|(\mathcal{I}(\tau)-l)\cap\mathcal{I}_k\big|\big)\gamma^l, \tag{S.2.33}$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\tau) - l = \{j - l : j \in \mathcal{I}(\tau)\}$, $\mathcal{I}(\tau) + l = \{j + l : j \in \mathcal{I}(\tau)\}$. Now, we make a key observation that $\big(\big|(\mathcal{I}(\tau)+l)\cap\mathcal{I}_k\big| + \big|(\mathcal{I}(\tau)-l)\cap\mathcal{I}_k\big|\big) \neq 0$ for at most $6(r_\tau + 1)$ many k at each fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}$. This is due to the fact that both $\mathcal{I}(\tau)$ and $\mathcal{I}_k$ consist of $r_\tau + 1$ *consecutive* positive integers, and the same is true for both $\mathcal{I}(\tau) - l$ and $\mathcal{I}(\tau) + l$. Hence, from (S.2.33) and Fubini's theorem,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \big|A_k(\tau)\big| \leq c_1 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \big(\big|(\mathcal{I}(\tau)+l)\cap\mathcal{I}_k\big| + \big|(\mathcal{I}(\tau)-l)\cap\mathcal{I}_k\big|\big)\gamma^l \leq 6c_1(r_\tau+1)\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\gamma^l < \infty.$$

This completes the proof. □

S.3. Auxiliary Technical Results

In this section, we collect some basic results from empirical process theory that we use throughout the proofs. Denote by $\mathcal{G}$ a class of functions that satisfies $|f(x)| \leq F(x) \leq U$ for every $f \in \mathcal{G}$ and let $\sigma^2 \geq \sup_{f\in\mathcal{G}} Pf^2$. Additionally, let for some $A > 0, V > 0$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$N(\mathcal{G}, L_j(\mathbb{P}_n); \varepsilon) \leq \Big(\frac{A\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}_n)}}{\varepsilon}\Big)^V. \tag{S.2.1}$$

In that case, the symmetrization inequality and inequality (2.2) from Koltchinskii (2006) yield

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq c_0\Big[\sigma\Big(\frac{V}{n}\log\frac{A\|F\|_{L^2(P)}}{\sigma}\Big)^{1/2} + \frac{VU}{n}\log\frac{A\|F\|_{L^2(P)}}{\sigma}\Big] \tag{S.2.2}$$

for a universal constant $c_0 > 0$ provided that $1 \geq \sigma^2 > \text{const}n^{-1}$ [in fact, the inequality in Koltchinskii (2006) is for $\sigma^2 = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{G}} Pf^2$. However, this is not a problem since we can replace $\mathcal{G}$ by $\mathcal{G}\sigma/(\sup_{f\in\mathcal{G}} Pf^2)^{1/2}$]. The second inequality (a refined version of Talagrand's concentration inequality) states that for any countable class of measurable functions $\mathcal{F}$ with elements mapping into $[-M, M]$

$$P\Big\{\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}} \geq 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{P}_n - P\|_{\mathcal{F}} + c_1 n^{-1/2}\Big(\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} Pf^2\Big)^{1/2}\sqrt{t} + n^{-1}c_j M t\Big\} \leq e^{-t}, \tag{S.2.3}$$

for all $t > 0$ and universal constants $c_1, c_j > 0$. This is a special case of Theorem 3 in Massart (2000) [in the notation of that paper, set $\varepsilon = 1$].

Lemma S.2.1. *Under (A1)-(A3) and $\xi_m^2(\log n)^2 = o(N)$ we have for any $\delta > 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \limsup_{N \to \infty} P\Big(\|\mathbf{u}_N\|_2^{-1} N^{1/2} \sup_{\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}, |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \leq \delta} \Big| \mathbf{u}_N^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau_1) - \mathbf{u}_N^\top \boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau_2) \Big| > \varepsilon \Big) = 0, \tag{S.2.4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{U}_N(\tau)$ is defined in (C.37).

Proof of Lemma S.2.1. See the proof for Lemma A.3 in Chao et al. (2016). □

Lemma S.2.2. *Let p be a polynomial of degree q. Then for arbitrary intervals $[a, b]$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ we have*

$$\Big| \int_a^b p^2(x)dx - \frac{b-a}{J} \sum_{j: j+\alpha \leq J} p^2\Big(a + \frac{j+\alpha}{J}(b-a) \Big) \Big| \leq \frac{C_q}{J-1} \int_a^b p^2(x)dx$$

for a constant $C_q > 1$ that depends only on q.

Proof of Lemma S.2.2. We begin by observing that it suffices to prove that for any polynomial p of degree q we have

$$\Big| \int_0^1 p^2(x)dx - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j: j+\alpha \leq J} p^2\Big(\frac{j+\alpha}{J} \Big) \Big| \leq \frac{C_q}{J} \int_0^1 p^2(x)dx. \tag{S.2.5}$$

To see this, note that for any polynomial p of degree q the function $\widetilde{p}_{a,b}(x) := p(a + x(b-a))(b-a)^{1/2}$ is also a polynomial of degree q and we have $\int_0^1 \widetilde{p}_{a,b}^2(x)dx = \int_a^b p^2(x)dx$ by a change of variables and

$$\frac{b-a}{J} \sum_{j: j+\alpha \leq J} p^2\Big(a + \frac{j+\alpha}{J}(b-a) \Big) = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j: j+\alpha \leq J} \widetilde{p}_{a,b}^2\Big(\frac{j+\alpha}{J} \Big).$$

To prove (S.2.5), consider the bound

$$\Big| \int_0^1 p^2(x)dx - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j: j+\alpha \leq J} p^2\Big(\frac{j+\alpha}{J} \Big) \Big| \leq \frac{1}{J-1} \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \Big| \frac{dp^2(x)}{dx} \Big| + \frac{2}{J} \sup_{x \in [0,1]} p^2(x),$$

where the first term on the right is from the difference of the two integrals on the interior partitions, and the second term handles the boundary partitions which are not included in the summation on the left. Thus we need to bound $\sup_{x \in [0,1]} \Big\{ \Big| \frac{dp^2(x)}{dx} \Big| + p^2(x) \Big\}$ by $C_q \int_0^1 p^2(x)dx$. To this end, denote by $\mathcal{P}_q$ the space of polynomials on $[0, 1]$ with degree less or equal to q. This is a finite-dimensional vector space. Note that the operator $\Phi : f \mapsto f' + f$ is a linear operator between the finite-dimensional, normed spaces $(\mathcal{P}_{2q}, \|\cdot\|_1)$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{2q}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$. Such an operator must be bounded, and hence there exists a constant C_q with $\|\Phi(p^2)\|_\infty \leq C_q \|p^2\|_1$. This completes the proof. □